NOTE

This Microfiche meets the quality requirements of the American National Standard for Microfiche of Documents (ANSI PH5.9-1975). However, because of imperfections in the document from which it was made, it contains images that are illegible or difficult to read. The source document for this microfiche is the best copy that could be obtained prior to filming.

Congressional Information Service, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE POLICY

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

DES MOINES, IOWA

OCTOBER 9, 1981

Serial No. J–97–68

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

90-377 O WASHINGTON : 1982

S521-29

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

[97th Congress]

STROM THURMOND, South Carolina, *Chairman*

CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., Maryland
PAUL LAXALT, Nevada
ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas
ALAN K. SIMPSON, Wyoming
JOHN P. EAST, North Carolina
CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Iowa
JEREMIAH DENTON, Alabama
ARLEN SPECTER, Pennsylvania

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., Delaware
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
DENNIS DECONCINI, Arizona
PATRICK J. LEAHY, Vermont
MAX BAUCUS, Montana
HOWELL HEFLIN, Alabama

VINTON DEVANE LIDE, *Chief Counsel*
QUENTIN CROMMELIN, JR., *Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE POLICY

ALAN K. SIMPSON, Wyoming, *Chairman*

STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Iowa

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
DENNIS DECONCINI, Arizona

RICHARD W. DAY, *Chief Counsel and Staff Director*
DONNA M. ALVARADO, *Counsel*
CHARLES O. WOOD, *Counsel*
ARNOLD H. LEIBOWITZ, *Special Counsel*

CONTENTS

OPENING STATEMENT

Page

Grassley, Hon. Charles E., a U.S. Senator from the State of Iowa 1

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

Cushing, Hank, Director, Office of Asian Programs, Bureau of Refugee Programs, U.S. State Department 4
Burnett, Richard E., regional director, Office of Refugee Resettlement, Kansas City, Mo 7
Quinn, Kenneth M., administrative assistant to the Governor of Iowa 17
Shearer, Colleen, director, Iowa Department of Job Service and Iowa Refugee Service Center 26
Harpster, Kathy, representative of the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society 46
Scherer, Sister Patricia, representative of the Catholic Council for Social Concern 49
Johnson, Wayne, regional consultant for refugee resettlement, Lutheran Social Service of Iowa 53
Herr, Roger, Bureau of Financial Assistance, Iowa Department of Social Services 67
Bellizzi, Nick, Des Moines Area Community College, Des Moines, Iowa 69
Drake, Murray, member, Polk County Board of Supervisors 79
Schutz, Michael K., Iowa State coordinator, Federation for American Immigration Reform 82
Baccam, Houng, former Tai Dam refugee 99
Saythongphet, Somsak, former Lao refugee 106
Nelson, Rev. James R., associate pastor, Grace United Methodist Church, Des Moines, Iowa 114

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF WITNESSES AND MATERIALS SUBMITTED

Baccam, Houng:
- Testimony 99
- Prepared statement 102

Bellizzi, Nick:
- Testimony 69
- Prepared statement 72

Burnett, Richard E.:
- Testimony 7
- Prepared statement 11

Cushing, Hank: Testimony 4
Drake, Murray: Testimony 79
Harpster, Kathy: Testimony 46
Herr, Roger:
- Testimony 67
- Comparison of Refugees in Iowa to Number of Refugees on Cash Assistance 68

Johnson, Wayne:
- Testimony 53
- Prepared statement 55

Nelson, Rev. James R.:
- Testimony 114
- Prepared statement 119

Page

Quinn, Kenneth M.:
Testimony 17
Prepared statement 20
Saythongphet, Somsak:
Testimony 106
Prepared statement 108
Scherer, Sister Patricia: Testimony 49
Schutz, Michael K.:
Testimony 82
Prepared statement 88
Shearer, Colleen: Testimony 26

APPENDIX

Prepared Statement of Bounlieng Phommasouvanh, Ph. D., president, The Federation of Lao Associations of the Americas 131
Prepared statement of Wesley S. Chapman, director, Office of Intercultural Programs, Des Moines Independent Community School District 134
Prepared statement of Sandra J. Bethel, refugee sponsor, refugee coordinator for the Church of the Brethern, Northern Plains District 140

REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1981

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE POLICY,
Des Moines, Iowa.

The subcommittee met at 9 a.m., in room 118, Iowa State Capitol, Des Moines, Iowa, Hon. Charles E. Grassley presiding.

Present: Ally Milder, Esq.

Senator GRASSLEY. I need to start on time, as I have an awful habit of letting things just drag on and I do have another hearing this afternoon, on the interest rates with Federal Reserve personnel downtown, at 2:30, and we're scheduled to finish here about 2.

Depending upon how things go this morning, I might at a late notice decide to go right through the noon hour and complete the hearing rather than breaking for lunch. I'd like to have people who are on the last panel, keep that in mind. Now, I don't know whether that's going to cause problems with people that maybe would not come until 1 o'clock; do you think?

Ms. MILDER. Is Mr. Nelson here?

Senator GRASSLEY. Yes, Reverend Nelson is here.

Ms. MILDER. And Messrs. Somsak and Houng are here.

Senator GRASSLEY. Yes. OK. So there's no problem with that.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF IOWA

Senator GRASSLEY. I'd like to call this meeting of the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Policy to order. This subcommittee is chaired by Senator Simpson, from the State of Wyoming, but he wasn't able to be with us. Senator Kennedy is a member of this subcommittee, as is Senator DeConcini, from Arizona, and Senator Strom Thurmond, from South Carolina, who is also chairman of the full Judiciary Committee.

This subcommittee is a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I want to begin by welcoming all of you here today to what I believe will be a very important hearing on an area which affects most communites in America, and one in which I feel Iowa and residents of Iowa have a leading role, a role to share with the people of this country, and the subcommittee for the sake of hopefully taking the very good aspects of Iowa's programs—apply them on a wider basis around the country in the administering of the refugee policy.

When the subject of the world refugee situation is raised along with the fact that these refugees need to be resettled somewhere, a place where they no longer feel the threat of persecution, the cry that is heard in Washington from many Americans is that we should not do this.

However, that cry doesn't come from Iowa, at least not very loudly, and the reason I'm here and the reason the subcommittee decided to hold this hearing is to find out why the atmosphere on refugee matters in Iowa is so positive, so that that positive aspect can be carried throughout the United States.

However, in order to determine why that cry is coming from many major cities in America it is necessary to go back and discover how the U.S. resettlement system developed. Refugee resettlement appeared in this country when the world situation dictated the necessity for it. When conflicts arose between nations America was willing to open its doors and accept those people displaced by these conflicts. Between the period of 1945 and 1960 refugees were resettled by the various voluntary agencies without Government assistance. During this time refugees had no access to public support and, therefore, had no expectations that the American Government was going to support them. At that time it was unthinkable.

When large numbers of Cubans arrived in the 1960's voluntary agencies received small grants to provide resettlement opportunities outside of southern Florida and States began to be reimbursed for welfare assistance provided to the refugees who settled there.

That brings us to 1975, when the Federal Government enlisted the help of the voluntary agencies in resettling those Southeast Asian refugees uprooted by the Vietnam conflict. A $500 resettlement grant was provided to the voluntary agencies for each refugee. This was to cover the transportation, housing and medical costs involved in the initial resettlement.

Under the present system the voluntary agencies meet in New York and divide up the responsibility for families who have been assigned for entry into America. Those agencies then place the families in various locations with the goal of helping them obtain self-sufficiency as quickly as possible.

However, at this point in the process a wrench is thrown into the system which may actually provide a disincentive to self-sufficiency. That wrench is public assistance.

The Department of Health and Human Services reimburses all State expenditures associated with refugee support at a rate of 100 percent for 3 years. Support payments are made at the same rate as Aid to Families with Dependent Children payments, regardless of family composition. This year 67 percent of all refugees who have entered the country since 1975 are drawing some form of public assistance, and this is up from last year's figure of 43 percent.

I believe this is the major reason why the term refugee has a negative connotation. The refugee program has become very expensive for this country. Over a billion dollars is spent on domestic program alone and, in order for the program to continue, changes must take place.

The purpose of this hearing is to explore the problems and discover possible solutions to the refugee resettlement program in America. As I stated before, the complaints don't emanate from Iowa and the solution to the rest of the country's refugee-related woes may lie on other States adopting programs modeled after Iowa's.

I am familiar with the great success Iowa's program has enjoyed and I hope its implementation nationally will solve some of these major refugee resettlement difficulties facing the United States today.

I'd now like to introduce the first panel to begin today's hearing.

I would like to introduce Mr. Hank Cushing, Dr. Richard Burnett, Mr. Ken Quinn, and Mrs. Colleen Shearer.

Mr. Cushing is currently serving as Director, Office of Asian Programs, under the bureau of Refugee Programs in the State Department. Prior to his service in the Asian programs he served as a senior officer in the Agency for International Development, coordinating nonmilitary aspects fo U.S. activity in Vietnam. He also was a part of the staff who evacuated Saigon in 1975, and has been involved in Indochinese refugee resettlement programs since that time.

Dr. Richard Burnett is the region VII Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and has held this position for 2 years. Prior to this time, he was an administrator at the University of Kansas, and prior to that, held the position of Deputy Regional Director for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Ken Quinn, whom I have known for the last 4 years since he's been with the Governor of Iowa and, as is Mr. Cushing, a career foreign service officer, who is on loan from the State Department to Governor Bob Ray's office and is currently serving as his administrative assistant. Previously Mr. Quinn held the position of Special assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, and he also served as a staff member under Henry Kissinger's chairmanship of the National Security Council, prior to Mr. Kissinger's becoming Secretary of State in 1972.

Mrs. Colleen Shearer, whom I've known for a long time and I might say, personally; I've had a close relationship with her sister who was a homemaker and farm wife and business manager of the farm only 2 miles from my farmstead, where my family is now living, out by Cedar Falls, Iowa. She has been with the Department of Job Service of Iowa and is director of that department, and for 8 years has also held the position of director of the Iowa refugee service center, in addition to being the State coordinator of refugee affairs. She's been involved in State government for almost 20 years, and is currently the only department head who has come up through State government ranks.

I'm very impressed with the qualifications of all these witnesses, and look forward to hearing their testimony. I would ask you to please proceed in the order that I introduced you, and feel free to summarize your written testimony, as the text, in full, will be placed in the record.

Hank, I want to express—not only to you, but to the people who don't know what a burden you've been under the last week or two

with your department, to meet certain deadlines, budgetary and policywise, and it is my understanding that Congress is as much as fault as anybody for your problems, and announced that you were unable to come out, and I personally called you and asked you if you'd come, because we sure would like to have you see this unique program, plus I wanted the benefit of your testimony before this committee. And here today you show up. I want to thank you very much, and I personally appreciate it. Let me say that if at some time you need a little bit of help out of a U.S. Senator, do feel free to call me; and if it doesn't cause me to compromise any of my basic principles, I'll be glad to respond.

STATEMENT OF HANK CUSHING, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF ASIAN PROGRAMS, BUREAU OF REFUGEE PROGRAMS, U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. CUSHING. Thank you very much, Senator. I'm very pleased to return to my own home State and to this capitol which, in all the years I lived in Iowa, I never had an opportunity to visit, and also to see an operation of refugee resettlement that has been, in my eyes, a model, as I've watched the Indochinese refugees come to America during the last 6 years.

You spoke in your opening statement of the fact that the Federal Government, from 1975 at the time of the evacuation of American personnel and associated nationals of Indochina to the United States, the Federal Government turned to voluntary agencies; and indeed we did. But we also turned to States. The then-President Ford requested State and local governments to assist in resettling over 130,000 people who came to the United States in just a few short weeks, in the spring of 1975. Iowa was among the very first to answer this call.

Since that time, when other State and local governments withdrew from the program, Iowa did not.

You're absolutely correct that the cries that this should no longer be a land of refuge did not come from Iowa. Quite the opposite. Iowa recongized that it is not an isolate State in the center of this Nation. It is part of the Nation that has worldwide responsibilities. And as an Iowan, I was very proud of that and, thus, I'm very happy to be able to see the operation more closely by visiting today.

I will not submit written testimony today for you, sir, since just over 2 weeks ago, the Attorney General, Mr. Smith, and Under Secretary of State Stoessel testified before your committee, and that is entirely on the record already. I would just like to highlight certain aspects of the points they developed there and to present the prespective of Washington for those joining you at this hearing.

Since early 1975 more than 1.5 million Indochinese refugees have left their homelands. That is an appalling number. It presented problems to first-asylum states—that is, those states neighboring Indochina that had to offer immediate assistance; and it presented great problems to what we call resettlement nations, including the United States, but not solely the United States.

It is appalling that nations so treat their citizenry that that many people must leave.

Now it is commonplace in the history of the past 60 years that as nations become dominated by totalitarian ideologies the winners cannot abide their former enemies or, indeed, those who won't make the complete act of faith in the new regime; and people thus are persecuted.

It is particularly evident in the history of the last 6 years in Indochina that the new rulers, who fought bravely, selflessly, energetically, with immense talent to achieve their end of the total domination of the countries of Indochina, could not then accommodate the vast numbers of people that they assumed control over and, in fact, so turned on them in paranoia that this number of people had to leave—a million and a half.

Of that number, the United States has over one-half million now, residents here. China has more than one-quarter of a million. Other nations of the world have a number very nearly equal to that which the United States has in relation to population. And still we have approximately 300,000 refugees in what we call first asylum, mainly in Thailand, with significant numbers also in Malaysia, Indonesia, Hong Kong, and the Philippines.

This problem has aggravated social and political situations in those first-asylum countries. They are not wealthy countries. Their ethnic composition is such that the arrival of other peoples is seen as a threat to their own stability, as well as their economic future. And so they turned elsewhere for help—the United States, to countries of Europe, to Canada, and Australia—for assistance in this matter, believing that they could not sustain first asylum unless they saw some relief in prospect.

Now, there is more than one way to relieve a refugee problem. Bringing every refugee to Iowa is not the sole solution to refugee problems. It is not the desirable solution. It is part of a solution, however, to bring refugees to this country, especially refugees who have association with us from the past, from our long—two decades long—involvement in Indochina.

One part of the solution is very prolonged first, or temporary, asylum until the situation in the homeland ameliorates and people believe they can safely go back. And that brings us to the second—voluntary repatriation.

If the situation in the homeland does not so change that people can return, then permanent resettlement in the country of first asylum is desirable. But if that is not possible, for political, social, or economic reasons, then some other area of resettlement becomes necessary so that first asylum can be maintained, so that the victims of persecution can have a place to flee safely.

And that's the role in Southeast Asia that the United States has played. And thus, 550,000 people have come to the United States in the last 6 years from Indochina, many, in fact most of them with associations with us; not all, however. In order to ameliorate the refugee problem in Southeast Asia we had to go beyond taking just those people with close associations of family, former employment, shared enterprise and shared risk we had also those with less association, less close connections, so that we could sustain first asylum and there would be a place for someone with close association to be able to land his boat, or a border he could cross.

It speaks well of the United States that it has taken the lead on this refugee issue, has recognized its past connection with Indochina and its deep involvement there, and has opened its doors.

Our door cannot, of course, be opened without limit to people who, for one reason or another—some very good reasons, some very weak reasons—wish to leave their own homelands. But the United States has a great responsibility in the world to lead in the search for solutions to terrible human problems.

I spoke earlier with pride that Iowa stepped into this and helped resettle people—a significant number—early in the program, and continuously to this date.

Sometimes it is said at the Federal Government level, and especially in the State Department, that our eyes are so focused on matters overseas that we do not remember that we are the State Department of a country with great domestic issues and problems, that we wish only to solve or ameliorate problems overseas, and that we're indifferent to the consequences for the fabric of life in America. I categorically deny that.

The Federal Government, indeed, establishes a refugee program. But we're quite aware that refugees don't live in a Federal Government reserve; they live in the States, they live in the cities. And in establishing a refugee program, insofar as we believe admissions to the United States are essential, we make, at the Federal level, an effort to consult and find out the problems at the domestic level, at the local level, and keep those considerations in our thinking as we come to a proposal before the Congress under the law for admissions at some future period. That is the process that was gone through for several months past, and the consultation process as required by law with the Judiciary Committees, of course, is just now being completed. And this could be thought of, sir, I'm sure, as a part of that consultation process, for the admissions for this coming fiscal year.

We are also mindful that whatever local problems there are in the resettlement of refugees, problems that aggravate or are aggravated by the economic circumstances of a particular community, that community too is part of the United States which has a leading role in the world. So I do not believe we should ever see a dichotomy between Des Moines, Iowa, and the United States, and the United States in its international role. We should all be mindful of the multiplicity of concerns. Iowa, I think, has always been so. And, as I say, I'm proud especially that I'm an Iowan, and it has had this leading role.

As you know, sir, from the testimony presented as of 2 weeks ago before the Senate Judiciary on the admissions, the administration proposed that there would be a total of 173,000 refugees to be admitted in fiscal 1982, but expressed the intent that this goal not be a target to be met, but a limit which might be reached, if necessary, to solve the problems as we saw them existing at the time and likely to develop in the course of the fiscal year.

In fact, our anticipated operating levels would probably bring in many fewer refugees. Of the 173,000 proposed, and discussed in consultation, up to 120,000 were to be from Indochina, with an expressed position by the administration that every effort would be made to bring many fewer in, perhaps only 100,000. The 120,000

would be a ceiling to be employed only if absolutely necessary to sustain first asylum and the other national goals of the United States in foreign policy matters.

I am unable now to say what the administration's final position, the Presidential decision, will be on the admissions for this year. First, there was the necessity of waiting for the Congress to express its views following the testimony in the Senate and in the House, and those views are only now reaching the administration. Soon the President will be able to turn his attention to this subject once again, despite all the other demands on him these days, and reach a decision. I can assure you, though, sir, that that decision will be mindful of the views expressed by Congress—very much mindful, and it will be reflective of what we have pointed out to the President regarding the domestic concerns.

In the Federal Government we very much share the view that you expressed earlier, that refugee resettlement here is a partial solution to a problem. But it is not necessary to provide everything for refugees once they arrive in this country. The refugee assistance program in the United States should not be designed to provide a specific economic status to a refugee. People earn their status in this country. Our assistance should be limited to those essential, bare necessities and to opportunities for full participation in American life—and that means working in America and contributing to our society, as well as benefiting from it.

So the Federal Government and the administration are not advocates of extravagant expenditures for domestic assistance, just as we are not advocates of unlimited refugee admissions. We wish to provide part of a solution to the problem, and not contribute to other problems in doing so.

Thank you for the opportunity of testifying, sir, and I'll be glad to answer questions.

Senator GRASSLEY. Thank you, Hank. I think I'm going to wait to ask questions. I have several questions for the panel and several for you individually, so--would it be possible, since your statements are going to appear in the record, to ask you to limit your testimony to 5 minutes—your oral testimony, as we have the benefit of your written testimony.

OK. Go ahead, Dr. Burnett.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD E. BURNETT, REGIONAL DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT, KANSAS CITY, MO.

Dr. BURNETT. Thank you, Senator Grassley.

I appreciate very much the chance to be here today to visit with you about the refugee resettlement program in America.

I think Mr. Cushing makes some excellent points and represents the Federal perspective very well in some of the comments that he made.

I would like to lift up for your consideration a few of the things mentioned in my prepared testimony.

Hank has mentioned the human suffering that gives rise to the movement of refugees. I think that it may be intriguing in its irony that nations, including the United States of America, may need what refugees have to offer almost as much as what the refugee-

receiving nation can offer the refugees. And I believe we should keep this in the background of our thinking as we look at the refugee situation.

Senator GRASSLEY. Can I comment on that very point?

Dr. BURNETT. Yes, Senator.

Senator GRASSLEY. I won't keep track of your time—or charge it to you, but——

[Laughter.]

Senator GRASSLEY [continuing]. I think as I've dealt with people who have come from a foreign land to make a home in America, they appreciate freedom much more than we do in this country. And if we can just learn that from people who come from a foreign land to this country, we'll have a much more solid society than we have today.

Dr. BURNETT. Precisely. I agree. The internal vigor and thrust so important to a society maintaining and improving itself may be dependent upon a periodic if not a continual influx of newcomers who are proving themselves to be not only survivors, but contributors.

I think ultimately, too, that ineffective resettlement management will prove to be very expensive, not only in terms of the refugee potential lost, but in the tax dollars ill used.

I'd like to say a few words about the Iowa resettlement program and why we believe it's successful; and I must say that from the perspective of a regional office in Kansas City, we enjoy immensely working with Iowa people, because this really is an outstanding program and we like to share the feeling of pride that Iowa has in its program.

I think Governor Ray deserves a good bit of credit for what's happened here. I think he made an excellent choice in selecting Colleen Shearer as the State refugee coordinator and in designating the Iowa Refugee Service Center as the single State agency, which moves the program ahead here. These folks have been assisted ably by Ken Quinn, from whom you'll hear in just a minute.

I think in Iowa, having someone like Colleen Shearer at a State director level provides opportunities for coordination within State government in Iowa that we have difficulty reaching in other States, because the State coordinators, for one reason or another, are not so fortuitously placed in the State structure. Colleen has just done an extraordinary job.

Senator GRASSLEY. That's visibility, as opposed to being submerged in the bowels of bureaucracy.

Dr. BURNETT. Yes, sir. And not only that, but what she brings, the perspective that she brings through the positions that she holds, and its close relationship to work, to jobs, and her tie-in with job service I think is just most fortunate. We applaud what has happened here.

In this time of diminished resources, we think anything that will accomplish the task without spending very many dollars is worth taking a look at. Iowa is developing an excellent volunteer program which we believe holds real merit and will be rewarding in the future as well as right now.

Colleen, assisted by Marvin Weidner, provide excellent leadership to the Iowa Refugee Service Center. These things look very good to us.

Just a word about Federal funding of the program.

Should Congress come up with an appropriation which matches the figure of nearly $584 million for the Department of Health and Human Services in the Office of Refugee Resettlement for fiscal year 1982—and we think this may not be reached now, in light of some information that's coming through just in the last day or two, at any rate, some things that OMB are saying to our people in Washington, this would represent a reduction from the previous year's funding level, this reduction tied almost entirely to the propose refugee flow, or the number of refugees who will be admitted during fiscal year 1982. In this region, we've been allocated in fiscal year 1981 about $20 million, and these dollars were used to serve almost 21,500 refugees in the four-State region. Iowa has the largest number of refugees—almost 8,000. Kansas would be next largest in this region, with about 6,750.

Can Iowa's program be implemented on a national level? Yes, I think many dimensions of it can. I believe that it's probably not practical to think in terms of lifting the Iowa program up and establishing it in toto in another region, because we have histories to deal with, and I think that just wouldn't fit. But we're already promoting many of the things that Iowa is doing on a regional and national basis.

For instance, Iowa's interest in keeping the welfare dependency rate down, we attempt to export this and help Iowa export this to other States in this region. We're going to be having a conference, a workshop, later this month in Kansas City that will involve the four States in our region. A major dimension of the program agenda for this workshop deals with jobs and how refugees and jobs can be brought together, and we credit Iowa with much of the impetus and leadership which has influenced us to put this on our program.

We think that strong refugee sponsorship is extremely important, and applaud Iowa's efforts in this direction. I think one of the keys to keeping the dependency rate lower is to make certain that sponsors stay with the job, are well oriented to the job and then I think there's a better chance that we'll stay away from the situation where, upon arrival, one of the first stops that the refugee makes is at the local welfare office. We think it's a mistake to operate in a fashion that permits that to happen.

Major problems facing us right not—I'll mention two or three—we've not done a good job in the Federal Government in making funds available on a timely basis to States. We recognize this, we're struggling with it, and I'm hopeful that it will improve in fiscal year 1982. Some of the things that have led to this, OMB has put some caution lights on our receiving apportionments, anticipating a major shortfall in cash and medical funds for fiscal year 1981. This led, then, to a consideration of withholding social service funds, to see what happened to the cash and medical funds as we approached the end of the year. And we got, as you know, sir, to almost monthly funding, which was very difficult for us to deal with.

The question of equity is an important question in our minds. We think that refugees should be treated in about the same fashion that needy Americans are treated, and the system has gotten a

little bit out of balance. As a result, as you have mentioned in your opening statement——

Senator GRASSLEY. By equity, do you mean that refugees have been treated, quote-unquote, better than low-income Americans, or not as well as low-income Americans?

Dr. BURNETT. When we waived the categorical relatedness side of being eligible for AFDC benefits, we put refugees in a privileged position, in that single adults and childless couples were made elibible for the benefits of refugee resettlement funds, where their counterparts were not.

And finally, in conclusion, may I say that history is replete with examples of nations' inhumanity to each other and to individuals, yet we keep looking for evidence that we have reason to be optimistic about the way we treat each other. And we think the refugee program is a splendid example of what can happen when any nation extends the hand of hope to people whose homeland has become so inhospitable that they believe themselves compelled to leave because there is no cause for hope at home.

I firmly believe that the vast majority of refugees seek only a chance, a chance to live and grow in freedom, a chance to continue becoming the kind of contributing human beings their Creator intended that they be, a chance that you and I, as Americans, never questioned, for it was a part of our birthright.

How humbling that, through an accident of birth, we are citizens of a country whose citizenship is so highly prized around the world that literally hundreds of thousands of people are willing to risk everything, including their lives, to join us. We should show by the way we live that we value the privilege of being Americans—a privilege we can, at one and the same time, have and share.

Thank you, sir.

Senator GRASSLEY. Thank you. I especially appreciate the last paragraph and I've expressed that same thought in speeches. It's a very basic appreciation of America.

[The prepared statement of Richard E. Burnett follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RICHARD E. BURNETT

I. Need for effective refugee resettlement programs.

World unrest and turmoil create conditions which encourage and in many instances force people to become refugees in order to survive. Various estimates place the total number of refugees and displaced persons from 12 million to 16 million worldwide.

The United States of America needs effective resettlement programs for refugees because:

A. There is human need and suffering in the world and a responsible member of the family of nations cannot turn its back on these unfortunate people.

B. It is in the political best interests of the United States of America that this country receive its share of refugees and assist them in becoming contributing citizens at the earliest reasonable time.

C. It is intriguing in its irony, yet nations including the United States of America may need what refugees have to offer almost as much as what the refugee receiving nation can offer the refugees. The internal vigor and thrust so important to a society maintaining and improving itself may be dependent upon a periodic if not a continual influx of newcomers who are proving themselves to be survivors and contributors.

D. An effective resettlement program provides a helping hand--not a continuing handout--to assist refugees in becoming self-sufficient.

E. The U.S.A. has received over 500,000 refugees and 150,000 entrants since 1975. With these people already in the country it is clear that we need effective programs to encourage them to enter the mainstream of American life.

F. Ineffective refugee resettlement programs will prove to be expensive both in terms of refugee potential unrealized and in tax dollars wasted.

II. Iowa's resettlement program and why it is successful.

Iowa moved quickly in 1975 to establish the State in the refugee program. A salient feature of the Iowa approach has been Governor Ray's personal interest and demonstrated concern in refugees. His leadership has led Iowa to a position of national and international prominence in working with refugees and to the selection of Iowa as a resettlement agency.

Governor Ray has made excellent choices in selecting Colleen Shearer as the State Refugee Coordinator and the Iowa Refugee Service Center as the single State agency. Placing the responsibility for the refugee program in Iowa at the Director level (Colleen Shearer--Job Service) has fostered a degree of coordination with the State which is proving difficult to achieve in most States in the nation.

These choices have insured that the many contributions of the Iowa Department of Social Services to the refugee program will continue to be a significant part of the base upon which the program can build.

The State Coordinator has been able to involve the Iowa Departments of Public Instruction and Social Services, as well as Iowa Job Service and the Iowa Refugee Service Center in developing support for refugees in a fashion which has been most effective.

Iowa has generated a significant level of Federal financial support for social services as compared with other States and has effectively utilized these resources in the refugee program.

The Iowa Refugee Service Center has developed a case management system which is designed to deliver resources and services to refugees on a timely basis. This adds to the focus of the program and should result in assistance being available when it is needed most.

Some creative program activity has been initiated by the Iowa Refugee Service Center. Among the positive outcomes have been better relationships between the refugee community and the Des Moines Police Department and some excellent orientation materials. Both of these projects addressed particular needs of refugees. State Coordinator Shearer and Iowa Refugee Service Center Manager, Marvin Weidner, should be applauded for their efforts.

In this time of diminished resources, anything which will accomplish the task without spending many dollars is worth considering. The volunteer program directed by the Iowa Refugee Service Center is in this category. There appears to be a rewarding future for this program.

Support from voluntary agencies has been helpful in developing the total refugee program in Iowa.

III. Federal funding of the refugee program.

Should Congress pass an appropriation measure which reflects the amount for the refugee program agreed upon in the reconciliation process, $583.7 million will be available for the program in FY 1982. This is a reduction of $65 million from the previous fiscal year. Of the $583.7 million, over $539 million will support State-administered Cash and Medical Assistance ($469.1 million) and Social Services ($70.4 million).

The reductions have taken place mainly because of the anticipated reduced flow of refugees into this country.

Education assistance for children garners $21.0 million, while voluntary agency matching grants will receive $9.0 million and preventive health programs, $7.1 million.

Funds supporting Cuban/Haitian domestic assistance are slated to total $94.0 million, with an additional $20.0 million for the reception and processing of Cuban/Haitian entrants.

At the Regional level in FY 1981, Region VII (Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska) was allocated slightly less than $20 million, with almost $16.8 million supporting Cash and Medical Assistance, and $2.9 million paying for social services. Of these amounts, Iowa received $6,687,855 for Cash and Medical Assistance, and $1,502,700 for Social Services.

Region VII currently has about 21,500 refugees, of which nearly 8,000 live in Iowa. The next largest number of refugees by State in the Region live in Kansas, approximately 6,750 refugees.

How can Iowa's program be implemented on a national level?

It is gratifying to note that some of the strong features of the Iowa program are already having an impact on the regional and national scenes. The leadership role of Iowa is probably best utilized by selecting outstanding features of the Iowa success and seeking their replication elsewhere.

Iowa's concern about keeping the Cash Assistance dependency rate low by encouraging refugees not to enter Cash Assistance roles unless it is absolutely necessary for them to receive Cash Assistance is a position which is becoming increasingly popular with other States. Also, spending the minimum time on Cash Assistance is being encouraged. This objective is most readily reached if the refugee has or can attain job skills and enter the work world with some command of the English language.

Strong refugee sponsorship is very important in helping the refugee become self sufficient. Iowa's decision to relate closely the refugee program with Iowa Job Service has been helpful. A regional workshop to be held in Kansas City later this month will attempt to reinfoce the Iowa approach on a regional basis. In great part because of Iowa's leadership, the workshop will emphasize the important role of jobs in a successful resettlement program.

A meeting of Refugee Resettlement Regional Directors to be held in Washington, D.C., later this month will devote a significant part of its agenda to volunteerism in working with refugees. Iowa's efforts in this area will be held up as worth emulating.

Perhaps the most helpful aspect of the Iowa program which might be exported would be the concern and dedication to assist refugees found in offices from the Governor to persons occupying Commissioner-level and Director-level posts to include the Iowa Refugee Coordinator, Iowa Refugee Service Center, the Iowa Department of Social Services and Iowa Job Service.

The concern and dedication found here are not focused exclusively on refugees who come to Iowa but have a strong regional and national dimension. Since these qualities are the outgrowth of attitudes held by key persons in Iowa's State government, this may be the most difficult thing to transplant to other States.

IV. Major problems in the refugee program.

A. The availability of Federal funds has been a problem in the fiscal year just concluded. Even though the Congress had passed an

appropriation bill containing $648.7 million to assist refugees, the Office of Refugee Resettlement had a difficult time getting the dollars to States in a timely fasion.

The problem seemed to be rooted in difficulty in getting an apportionment from the Office of Management and Budget which constituted a release of funds for pass-through to the States. OMB's reluctance to release the funds appeared to be tied to a concern over a potential shortfall in funding for the Cash and Medical Assistance portion of the program.

Funds for Social Services were delayed because it was believed that should a shortfall for Cash and Medical Assistance actually develop, Social Service funds might be transferred to the Cash and Medical account to meet that need. Underlying the whole problem was a rising rate of Cash Assistance dependency on the part of refugees.

The result was that during the last quarter of FY 1981 funding was available on a monthly basis, which left all who work with refugees and the refugees themselves in an uncomfortable situation, not knowing whether funding would be forthcoming or not.

The uncertainty which has surrounded funding makes planning extremely difficult at all levels.

B. The question of equity looms large on the horizon of problems which must be dealt with expeditiously. The Department has strong misgivings about continuing to provide assistance for refugees at a level above that available for needy Americans. The lack of equity has developed because it was believed initially that refugees suffered from such severe financial problems that it was necessary to waive categorical relatedness in determining eligibility for cash assistance, the waiving of which allowed some single adults, childless couples, and unemployed parents in States without unemployed parents/AFDC programs to receive benefits while their needy American counterparts in similar situations could not receive these benefits.

Policy changes under consideration are aimed at moving toward a more equitable relationship regarding financial support for refugees and needy Americans.

No decision has been reached as to the path to be taken, but it will eventuate in a policy which shortens the time during which refugees can continue receiving full cash benefits while their similarly situated needy American counterparts cannot receive benefits at a comparable level.

Rigorous enforcement of the 36-month statutory limitation of one hundred percent reimbursement by Federal funds should encourage refugees to become self-supporting.

. Conclusion

History is replete with examples of our inhumanity to each other, yet we keep searching for evidence which gives us cause to be optimistic about the future of spaceship earth and its passengers.

The refugee program is a splendid example of what can happend when any nation extends the hand of hope to people whose homeland has become so inhospitable that they believe themselves compelled to leave because there is no cause for hope there.

I firmly believe that the vast majority of refugees seek only a chance, a chance to live and grow in freedom, a chance to continue becoming the kind of contributing human beings their Creator intended that they be, a chance that you and I as Americans never questioned, for it was a part of our birthright.

How humbling that, through an accident of birth, we are citizens of a country whose citizenship is so highly prized around the world that literally hundreds of thousands of people are willing to risk everything, including their lives, to join us. That we should show by the way we live that we value the privilege of being Americans--a privilege we can, at one and the same time, have and share.

Senator GRASSLEY. Ken?
Mr. QUINN. Thank you, Senator.

STATEMENT OF KENNETH M. QUINN, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT TO THE GOVERNOR OF IOWA

Mr. QUINN. I appreciate very much this opportunity to come before you and to represent Governor Ray in addressing this issue. The Governor asked me to extend to you his regrets that he could not be here today, and also to pass on his commendation to you for your initiative in having this hearing and your attention to the subject.

He also asked me to make one key point that he would make if he were here today. This goes back to the point that you raised in your opening statement, that there is, in a good part of the country today, many people talking about the need to limit immigration, that it's time to close our doors. And in making decisions on these matters of public policy, the Governor believes that it's critical that we always maintain the distinction between different groups and categories of people that are entering our country, the reasons for which they're coming, and the policies that we've had toward them in the past.

First, he would see the distinction, for example, regarding illegal aliens who are coming from Mexico, and the fact that those people have to be addressed in light of the unique problems and the implications of any decision there.

Second, there's the Cubans and the Haitians who are coming uninvited to the shores of Florida.

And, third, refugees to whom we have intentionally extended a hand and opened our doors and, in Iowa, opened our homes and our hearts to receive them here because so many of them were in danger of dying. The Governor's and our State's actions have always been predicated on receiving these people because we were helping them escape death.

In 1979, as you recall, the boat people were being pushed off the shores in frail, unseaworthy boats with hundreds at a time—the majority innocent women and children—drowning. Governor Ray felt that we really had two choices: Either do something about it, or turn our backs and do nothing. And it's always been his feeling that there was only one real choice if we were to be true to our Christian-Judaeo heritage, and that is to try to do those things within our means to save human lives.

The Iowa program, if I could talk about it just very briefly, really started in 1975 at President Ford's request that we do something to help receive part of the first 133,000 refugees from Indochina. At that time Governor Ray decided that we would take some refugees. A group was discovered in one of the camps in California by an Iowan who had been working in Laos among them——

Ms. SHEARER. He was still in Thailand then.

Mr. QUINN. He was still in Thailand.

Well, the Tai Dam, a group of people ethnically separate, were brought here with the theory that if we settled them all together, that their own social structure would remain intact and that they

would be able to be of assistance to each other. And so 1,500 were brought here.

And because of the work of Colleen Shearer and the refugee service center and the sponsors who were involved and the refugees themselves, they made really tremendous accomplishments. In the latest survey, over 80 percent of them, because they've had jobs and been earning money, own their own homes, and virtually all of them have been working.

So we felt in 1979 that we could build upon that success, and that is why the Governor agreed then to bring in another 1,500 refugees.

The question is: Why have we been successful?

One reason, as I mentioned before, is the sponsors. There's hundreds and hundreds of Iowans who have come forward giving of themselves to help these people.

Second, has been the job orientation that has been prevalent in the program: the involvement of job service, as opposed to our department of social services as the lead agency; and the fact that we have job counselors around the State who are looking for job placements for these refugees.

Third, is the outreach work done by many of the caseworkers—many of whom are here today with us—from the refugee center. We don't consider our obligation ended when the refugees arrive here. We are constantly following up, trying to discover problems and intervene before they become serious ones.

In addition, we've had a marvelous volunteer tutor program, started in February 1979, in which we sought individual Iowans to give their time to help teach English to the refugee children or adults in their home. And that program has been working in a vast majority of Iowa counties.

In addition, our community schools and community colleges have established an adult English language program, where adults can study at night.

And, there's been the work done by many of the Iowa voluntary agencies. Our refugee center resettles only half of the refugees in the State. The other half are brought here by voluntary agencies.

Finally, the climate of acceptability in Iowa has remained high, because of the fact that the funding for these programs has remained at the Federal level. And while we realize that in times of diminished resources in many cases, quite properly, this funding may have to be reduced or cut down, we'd urge that it continue to remain a Federal responsibility. Nothing cuts into this climate of acceptability more than if, somehow, the burden does get passed down to the cities and the counties.

This is particularly true in education. We now have approximately—a little over 4,000 students of limited English ability in the State, 1,400 of them here in Des Moines. And to the extent that the Federal Government can make money available, as it has in the past, to schools—right to the school districts—to help pay for any tutors or teachers, that is I'm sure very appreciated, and it's a marvelous help.

I would just mention that currently, at this time, the Des Moines school district is competing for $367,000 from the Department of Education, to help fund part of that program, and the decision is in

question. So anything you can do with the Department of Education I know would be most appreciated by the school district, and very helpful in that regard. These are funds that are available now.

So, in summary, we have tried to integrate refugees into the mainstream of Iowa society, to make them taxpaying, producing citizens as quickly as possible. And I think much of that credit goes to Colleen and the refugee service center.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Kenneth M. Quinn follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF KENNETH M. QUINN

SENATOR GRASSLEY

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY FOR ME TO REPRESENT GOVERNOR RAY IN APPEARING BEFORE YOU. AS YOU KNOW, THE GOVERNOR IS LEAVING FOR A TRIP TO JAPAN AND THEREFORE COULD NOT BE AVAILABLE TO TESTIFY.

GOVERNOR RAY DID ASK ME, HOWEVER, TO EXTEND TO YOU HIS REGRETS THAT HE COULD NOT JOIN YOU AS WELL AS HIS COMMENDATION FOR YOUR INTEREST AND INITIATIVE IN HOLDING THIS HEARING.

THE QUESTION OF IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND ILLEGAL ALIENS IS ONE THAT WE CONFRONT OFTEN IN THE MEDIA THESE DAYS. THE INFLUX OF HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF UNINVITED PEOPLE EACH YEAR OBVIOUSLY PRODUCES STRAIN ON MANY PARTS OF OUR SOCIETY AND CAN SEVERELY TAX THE RESOURCES OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN BOTH HEAVILY IMPACTED AREAS WHERE LARGE CONCENTRATION OF THESE PEOPLE EXIST AS WELL AS SMALL RURAL AREAS WHERE ONLY A FEW PEOPLE MAY SETTLE. THIS HAS BEEN PARTICULARLY TRUE FOLLOWING THE FLOOD OF CUBAN AND HAITIAN ENTRANTS INTO SOUTH FLORIDA LAST YEAR - AN EVENT WHICH UNFORTUNATELY HAS HAD NEGATIVE IMPLICATIONS FOR ALL REFUGEE PROGRAMS.

FOR THIS REASON, GOVERNOR RAY ASKED ME TO EMPHASIZE AT THE OUTSET THE DISTINCTIONS HE SEES AMONG THE VARIOUS CATEGORIES OF PEOPLE ENTERING OUR COUNTRY AND THE DIFFERENT POLICIES HE BELIEVES SHOULD APPLY TO EACH. IN ADDITION TO THE SEVERAL HUNDRED THOUSAND PEOPLE WHO ENTER THE U.S. EACH YEAR THROUGH NORMAL IMMIGRATION CHANNELS, WE WOULD SEE THREE DISTINCT OTHER GROUPS EACH OF WHICH SHOULD BE ADDRESSED SEPARATELY.

FIRST IS THE QUESTION OF THE STATUS OF ILLEGAL ALIENS WHO ENTER THIS COUNTRY PRIMARILY FROM MEXICO. THIS ISSUE HAS ITS OWN UNIQUE FEATURES AND COMPLEX PROBLEMS - NOT THE LEAST OF WHICH IS THE IMPACT OUR POLICY TOWARDS THESE PEOPLE HAS ON THE CRITICALLY IMPORTANT BI-LATERAL RELATIONSHIP WE HAVE WITH THE MEXICAN GOVERNMENT. IT IS NOT OUR INTENTION HERE TODAY TO MAKE ANY RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING WHAT OUR POLICY TOWARDS THESE PEOPLE SHOULD BE; - RATHER WE WISH TO MERELY POINT OUT THAT THEY ARE A SEPERATE PROBLEM WITH ITS OWN INHERENT FACTORS.

THE SAME STATEMENT CAN BE MADE ABOUT THE TIDAL WAVE OF HUMANS THAT FLOWED OUT OF MARIEL, CUBA. WHILE WE REALIZE THAT IT MAY BE HARD TO RECOGNIZE THE DISTINCTION WHEN YOU ARE TRYING TO COPE WITH THE DAY TO DAY PROBLEMS, WE BELIEVE IT IS CLEAR THAT THERE IS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THOSE PEOPLE - WHO CAME HERE UNINVITED AND THE INDOCHINESE REFUGEES TO WHOM WE EXTENDED A HAND BECAUSE OF MORAL AND HUMANITARIAN CONSIDERATIONS.

AS YOU CONTEMPLATE DECISIONS AFFECTING FUTURE REFUGEE POLICY, WE HOPE YOU WILL KEEP THESE DIFFERENCES IN MIND. WE SHOULD ALWAYS REMEMBER THE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT PERTAINED IN 1979 WHEN GOVERNOR RAY AND OTHERS ACTED TO SAVE THE LIVES OF THE "BOAT PEOPLE" - THE MAJORITY OF THEM INNOCENT WOMEN AND CHILDREN - AS THEY WERE DROWNING WHEN THEIR FRAIL UNSEAWORTHY BOATS WERE PUSHED BACK OUT TO SEA. AT THAT TIME THE GOVERNOR NOTED THAT WE IN IOWA ESSENTIALLY HAD TWO CHOICES: EITHER WE COULD REACH OUT AND, LEND A HAND TO THESE UNFORTUNATE PEOPLE; OR, WE COULD TURN OUR BACKS AND ALLOW THEM TO

CONTINUE TO DIE. WE DID THE ONLY THING WE COULD DO AND STILL REMAIN TRUE TO OUR CHRISTIAN-JUDAEO HERITAGE. IOWANS OPENED THEIR HEARTS AND THEIR HOMES TO ACCEPT 1,500 OF THESE REFUGEES AND THAT WAS THE START OF A NATIONWIDE EFFORT TO ALLEVIATE THE SUFFERING OF THESE PEOPLE. BY THE END OF 1979, THANKS IN LARGE MEASURE TO AMERICAN AND DARE I SAY, IOWAN - LEADERSHIP, THE STRING OF DEATHS HAD BEEN BROKEN AND THE WORLD HAD RESPONDED TO TAKE IN OVER ONE MILLION REFUGEES.

IN 1981, IN THE MIDST OF DIMINISHED FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND CALLS TO CURTAIL ALL IMMIGRATION, WE NEED TO REMEMBER WHY WE ACTED AS WE DID IN 1979 - TO SAVE HUMAN LIVES AND TO ASSIST PEOPLE WHO HAD STOOD WITH US DURING THE WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA. WHETHER YOU AGREED OR DISAGREED WITH OUR POLICIES IN INDOCHINA, IT IS POSSIBLE TO RECOGNIZE THAT THE U.S. GOVERNMENT HAS AN OBLIGATION TO ASSIST THOSE WHO FOUGHT WITH US, WORKED FOR US OR SUPPORTED THE GOVERNMENTS WITH WHICH WE WERE ALLIED. AS YOU VOTE IN WASHINGTON, WE WOULD URGE YOU TO KEEP THIS HISTORY IN MIND AS WELL AS THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE INDOCHINESE REFUGEES - TO WHOM WE REACHED OUT - AND THE OTHER GROUPS OF REFUGEES WHO ARRIVE HERE UNINVITED. THE INDO-CHINESE, WE WOULD ARGUE, HAVE BEEN QUITE SUCCESSFUL IN ADJUSTING TO LIFE HERE AND HAVE MADE MANY POSITIVE CONTRIBUTIONS TO OUR SOCIETY. A GOOD EXAMPLE OF THIS IS THE EXPERIENCE OF THE TAI DAM HERE IN IOWA.

I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS ONE OTHER ASPECT OF THE REFUGEE PROGRAM - THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROVIDING ASSISTANCE WHICH WE BELIEVE BELONGS CENTRALIZED AT THE

FEDERAL LEVEL. WHILE IOWANS HAVE RESPONDED MAGNIFICENTLY IN WELCOMING REFUGEES, THE DECISION TO ADMIT THEM INTO THE UNITED STATES BELONGS UNIQUELY TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. IT DETERMINES THE NUMBERS WHO WILL BE ALLOWED TO ENTER AND THE PACE AT WHICH THEY WILL COME.

STATES, CITIES AND COUNTIES HAVE LITTLE CONTROL OVER WHERE THE REFUGEES WILL ULTIMATELY SETTLE. IT IS A WELL KNOWN FACT THAT THEY HAVE GRAVITATED TO WARMER CLIMATES, PRODUCING LARGE CONCENTRATIONS IN CERTAIN AREAS. THIS IN TURN PRODUCES UNEVEN BURDENS ON LOCAL TAXPAYERS WHO HAVE TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL SOCIAL, MEDICAL AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES OUT OF ALREADY STRAINED BUDGETS. NOTHING IS MORE DETRIMENTAL TO THE CLIMATE OF ACCEPTIBILITY THAN THESE ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS.

IN ORDER TO DISTRIBUTE THE COST FOR THESE EXPENSES EVENLY TO ALL TAXPAYERS, WE WOULD URGE CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL FUNDING FOR REFUGEE PROGRAMS. THE STATES AND THE COUNTIES AND CITIES ARE NOT ABLE TO PICK UP ALL THESE COSTS. IN ADDITION, WE WOULD RECOMMEND STRONG CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO ONCE AGAIN PROVIDING FEDERAL FUNDS TO SCHOOLS EDUCATING REFUGEE CHILDREN. THERE ARE CURRENTLY 4,264 CHILDREN OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY IN THE STATE - APPROXIMATELY 1,400 OF THEM ARE IN THE DES MOINES SCHOOL DISTRICT ALONE. YOU KNOW ALL TOO WELL THAT OUR SCHOOLS ARE OPERATING ON EXTREMELY TIGHT BUDGETS, SO I KNOW THEY WOULD BE MOST APPRECIATIVE OF ANY SUPPORT YOU COULD GIVE TO LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE THEM SOME ASSISTANCE. FOR EXAMPLE, THE DES MOINES SCHOOL SYSTEM IS CURRENTLY COMPETING FOR $367,000 IN FEDERAL FUNDS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S ESL PROGRAM. THIS MONEY WOULD BE UTILIZED TO

HIRE 10 TEACHERS AND 10 TUTORS. YOUR CONTACTING SECRETARY BELL TO URGE THAT DES MOINES RECEIVE THESE FUNDS WOULD BE A TREMENDOUS BOOST FOR OUR CHANCES.

IN CONCLUSION, MAY I SAY THAT GOVERNOR RAY AND ALL OF US ASSOCIATED WITH THE REFUGEE PROGRAM IN IOWA ARE IMMENSELY PROUD OF THE RESULTS WE HAVE OBTAINED IN THE SIX YEARS IT HAS BEEN IN OPERATION. WE BELIEVE THERE ARE SEVERAL REASONS FOR THIS SUCCESS:

- GREAT CREDIT FOR THIS PERFORMANCE MUST GO TO THE SPONSORS -- THOSE IOWANS WHO VOLUNTARILY CAME FORWARD TO ACCEPT THE MORAL COMMITMENT OF HELPING A REFUGEE FAMILY START ANEW. WITHOUT THEIR SELFLESS DEVOTION AND GIVING, THIS SUCCESS WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN POSSIBLE. CONCERNED, DEDICATED SPONSORS REMAIN A CRUCIAL INGREDIENT IN ANY RESETTLEMENT EFFORT.

- A SECOND FACTOR IN THE SUCCESS OF THIS EFFORT WAS THE "JOB ORIENTATION" GIVEN TO THE REFUGEE PROGRAM. FROM THE BEGINNING, IOWA OFFICES STROVE TO GIVE THE PROGRAM A JOB EMPHASIS. FOR EXAMPLE, COLLEEN SHEARER, THE HEAD OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF JOB SERVICE, WAS NAMED AS DIRECTOR OF THE REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT, AND SPECIALISTS WERE HIRED TO WORK BOTH IN THE IOWA REFUGEE SERVICE CENTER AND IN THE JOB SERVICE DEPARTMENT TO COUNSEL THE REFUGEES ON EMPLOYMENT AND TO HELP THEM FIND JOBS. THIS LINKAGE HAS BEEN INVALUABLE IN CREATING A WORK CLIMATE RATHER THAN A WELFARE CLIMATE, AS HAS OCCURRED IN SOME OTHER AREAS. AS GOVERNOR RAY PUT IT, "I CANNONT OVER EMPHASIZE THE IMPORTANCE I ATTACH TO INCLUCATING THESE NEW ARRIVALS WITH A WORK ETHIC".

• A THIRD FACTOR IN THE SUCCESS OF THE IOWA PROGRAM HAS BEEN THE OUTREACH WORK DONE BY THE CASE WORKERS AT THE REFUGEE SERVICE CENTER. ONCE A REFUGEE IS TRANSFERRED TO HIS OR HER SPONSOR, WE DO NOT CONSIDER OUR OBLIGATION ENDED. IN FACT, FOLLOW-UP IS CONSIDERED TO BE AN ESSENTIAL PART OF THE RESETTLEMENT PROCESS. BY MAINTAINING THIS RELATIVELY SMALL AND INEXPENSIVE OFFICE, THE REFUGEE KNOWS HE OR SHE ALWAYS HAS A PLACE TO TURN FOR HELP AND ASSISTANCE, IF NEEDED; AND WE HAVE A WAY OF FOLLOWING THAT PERSON'S PROGRESS AND THE CAPABILITY TO STEP IN WITH GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING SHOULD THAT NEED ARISE.

IN THE END, THE IOWA PROGRAM IS AIMED AT INTEGRATING THE REFUGEES INTO THE MAINSTREAM OF AMERICAN SOCIETY AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE. IN THIS WAY THE REFUGEE WILL SOON BE ABLE TO STAND ON HIS OR HER OWN TWO FEET -- WITH DIGNITY.

ON BEHALF OF GOVERNOR RAY, MAY I AGAIN THANK YOU FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY TO APPEAR BEFORE YOUR COMMITTEE.

Senator GRASSLEY. Colleen?

Ms. SHEARER. I beg your indulgence, Senator Grassley. I cannot adhere exactly to the 5-minute limit. Mine is not structured that way. On the other hand, perhaps we should consider ourselves lucky that I've got a prepared text, because on this subject I could go on for a long time, without one.

STATEMENT OF COLLEEN SHEARER, DIRECTOR, IOWA DEPARTMENT OF JOB SERVICE AND IOWA REFUGEE SERVICE CENTER

Ms. SHEARER. In the past 6 years the Iowa program for resettling refugees has gained a reputation which we consider to be well earned. It is a program which stresses an organizational structure directed to achieve goals, which emphasizes management of resources in the most productive way and which possesses a high degree of accountability—all created as a means to achieve the main goal of both financial and social self-sufficiency for refugees.

The Iowa program has also gained a reputation for being pragmatic about the delicate and controversial matter of bringing new people to our shores. It has also gained a reputation of being tough-minded and has even been called callous in its service to refugees.

Those are perceptions which we have accepted, whether we felt fairly complimented or unfairly castigated, because we knew our methods would prove themselves over time. The fact that so many of our recommendations are now being adopted by others is the beginning of that proof.

We believe that the basic organizational and management concepts which typify the Iowa Refugee Service Center could provide a pattern for the entire domestic refugee resettlement program in this country. Most of what we've done is not Iowa-specific; it is exportable and the program should be looked at seriously by the decisionmakers at the national level.

Since our involvement began in 1975, we in Iowa have been supportive of refugee resettlement in this country. We have also been critical of it. The criticism has, of course, gained us more notoriety than our support. But that's OK, because that criticism is today beginning to change the domestic side of the program. The criticism developed from our own experiences in resettling refugees, coupled with our understanding of the political environment in which the entire program functions.

We spoke out as early as November 1976, on the subject of increasing usage of welfare by the refugees. The trend was unmistakable. These statements were so startling at the time that the story was carried by network television. Yet nothing was done to rectify the situation when it would have been easier to change. Today we see the fruits of that particular harvest. Never has the phrase, "As ye sow, so shall ye reap," been more true.

If we had reversed that trend in 1976, it is my belief that there would today be almost no public resentment about and opposition to the continued admissions of Indochinese refugees into this country, even with the present recession. The program could then be viewed in the proper perspective, which is that it is a small program, dealing with a small number of people, and if properly administered, costing a small amount of money.

Change now appears to be underway. It is too bad that the changes were not inaugurated as a result of planning, but are happening as a knee-jerk reaction to public resentment. It is ironic to note that change would probably not be a part of today's refugee program if it were not for the recession.

At any rate, let us assume for a moment that the program is on its way toward improvement; let us assume for a moment that such an improvement will change public perception and acceptance. Therefore, let us assume that we can afford to dedicate some time and attention to going a step beyond the systems and the programs, to the refugees themselves.

While the Iowa program has gained a certain reputation, I am also aware that in heading that program I, too, have developed an image of hardheadedness and, in some people's estimation, hardheartedness toward refugees.

While that wasn't always easy to live with, in many ways I encouraged that image. I encouraged it because I believed in what we were doing and I thought it was important for people to see that one need not be identified as a "bleeding heart" in order to engage in humanitarian work—that very possibly someone identified as a "midwestern conservative" could perform an even better brand of resettlement than was taking place elsewhere.

At any rate, I earned the reputation rightfully. I am tough-minded and I do look on refugee resettlement as a program which must be carefully managed with specific goals of self-sufficiency and marketed to the American public in a manner which is acceptable to them.

I also think I have earned the right to step out of that role as a public administrator for a few moments in order to share some of my seldom stated personal points of view about this Nation's role in the international community as it continues to face the fact of 16 million homeless people across the globe.

I think I have earned the right to ask that all in the room permit me the privilege, after 6 years of dedication to making our Iowa program the best it can be in good times and in hard times, of speaking only for myself, not only to an old friend, but to an elected official in our Federal Government, in order to add another dimension to what is being said here today. Perhaps at this moment in history, when our thoughts and our energies are devoted almost exclusively to solving economic problems, and when we are cutting expenditures in our homes and our businesses and our governments, it is appropriate.

We have all witnessed human tragedy. We have seen it inflicted by war, by famine, by earthquakes and floods—and by man against man when it isn't even called a war.

We have all witnessed human tragedy perpetrated by people outside our country upon others outside our country. The visual images we receive of these tragedies are provided to us by photographs in newspapers. They have little impact upon us because they are flat and lacking in life.

But even when we see those same events in "living color" on our television sets, we don't really feel the tragedy; we merely mark it down as one of those things that happen in the evolution of man and his world.

We have also witnessed tragedy imposed upon mankind by our own people and our country . . . by us. That kind of tragedy leaves us uncomfortable, even several generations later. It leaves us uneasy because we know we really cannot excuse the actions.

I refer to such things as this country's turning back of the St. Louis, the ship which carried Jews back to Hitler for killing. Our citizens and our Congress let this happen.

I refer to the incarceration of the Japanese-Americans during World War II—internment camps here in our own country for some of our own citizens. While it has not been recorded that any lives were lost as a direct result of this act, it has nevertheless been an embarrassment to us ever since. Our citizens and our Congress let this happen.

I refer to our war in Southeast Asia. It was a war that—for whatever reason—we backed away from. We used the people of those nations—Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia—to fight our battles. We used them to save the lives of our own young men and we used them with little regard for them as human beings. Regardless of the rationale at the time, the fact remains that we used them. Again, we all let that happen.

Today we are on the threshold of bringing about another human tragedy in Southeast Asia. And we are beginning to look for reasons to excuse ourselves from continuing to save the people we set on the path to destruction.

Congress is faced today with a most difficult task: How to legislate when it must balance human lives and money. The Members of Congress have my sympathy and understanding as they face the grave responsibility. But that doesn't change the fact that a balance must be struck.

The solution does not lie in determining arbitrary numbers of people to be allowed entry into our country. The solution lies, first, in determining where the citizens of this country and their elected leaders stand on the matter of human lives. Sometimes this is called human rights, but it's more basic than that. It is a matter of human beings making decisions about human lives. I would hope that this country could proudly stand among the nations of the world and proclaim its commitment to saving lives—and then act upon that commitment in those areas of the world where we have helped to create the problem. Today I refer specifically to Indochina and the Indochinese people. More than any other homeless people in the world, they are our refugees. They are our responsibility.

Second, should that decision be made and this country, for all the right reasons, decides to aggressively continue the program to save the people of Indochina, then the solution depends upon the rules we make for resettling them in this country. I don't mean the rules for admitting them but the rules for resettling them.

It really wouldn't be too hard to devise the type of domestic program which would produce the self-sufficiency about which we all talk, and about which we do little or nothing. We have reached the point where we are blaming our victims, the Indochinese. We are complaining about welfare usage, but no one has really gone back to the basics in trying to change the program so that it results in fewer signing up for welfare. We just criticize the refugees.

And, furthermore, we do nothing to quiet those among us who are vocal against the Indochinese. Those people are vocal because they lack knowledge about why the refugees are here and their true impact upon our society, and they lack knowledge about why refugees use welfare. We who do have knowledge should know that we carry an extra burden—that of educating people to the facts. Not enough of us do not; we remain silent.

And so the public resentment grows and grows.

And Congress listens.

And Congress sends delegations to Thailand to look at the camps.

And Congress is forced to look for reasons to cut the flow of Indochinese refugees; they look for reasons to excuse us from our responsiblity to these people. And, thus, the theory of economic versus political refugees is born.

How can we, of this culture, define an economic refugee or a political refugee of another culture? How can we, of this culture, set standards which affect another culture whose standards are so different?

I recently read a letter, dated September 11, 1981, written to President Reagan and submitted in testimony at the Consultation on Refugee Admissions on September 22, 1981. The letter was from The Federation of Lao Associations of the Americas and was signed by several officers of that association, including its President, Dr. Bounlieng Phommasouvanh, who happens to live in Iowa City, Iowa.

That letter was written by people who know the truth about economic and political refugees in Southeast Asia. And that letter says, "We believe that no such distinction is possible."

The letter tells that the Indochinese people have never left their homelands in ages past, regardless of wars or famine or economic problems. Speaking about the people of Laos, the letter says:

> They do not leave for economic reasons. They leave because of persecution. They leave because they have found that they are misled by the empty promises of the . . . communists. They leave because they are forced to work all day without pay and to participate in "indoctrination" sessions every evening while their children are left at home unfed and unattended. They leave because the communists watch over everything they do. They leave because false accusations against people are frequent and people are arrested without due process of law. They leave because their country, from the village level up to the level of the central government in Vientiane, has been sold out to and infiltrated by the communists . . . They leave because their cultural heritage—their most basic beliefs about religion and the value of the family—has been destroyed. They leave because there is no freedom of speech—because anything that is said about the government may be construed as a criminal act. They leave because there is no freedom of assembly—because any meeting of two or three people may be construed as a criminal conspiracy. They leave because they do not want to live in constant fear and anxiety. They leave because they know that life is not worth living under circumstances like those.

Some of the reasons to support the economic refugee theory state that the people flee to the refugee camps because they are more attractive to them than their own homes in their own countries. But the reasons do not state that the attractiveness of the camps has nothing to do with economics. What is attractive about the squalid and boring camps is that in those camps "people don't have to live in constant fear; . . . they can talk without being afraid of being reported to the authorities and arrested; . . . they can live together with their families in freedom."

It is so simple. It is true of the Lao people and the Cambodian people and the Vietnamese people. They are leaving for the sake of freedom—that glorious word that can bring tears to an American patriot's eyes when the flag flies and the band plays the national anthem—freedom.

Is it so strange that they would risk their lives to seek freedom in America, the land established for the sake of freedom? It has nothing to do with economics, and I am embarrassed that some people will offer testimony to you and your counterparts in the Congress of this great Nation that these are economic refugees.

I know that this country faces frightening economic difficulties—and I know that our daily lives will be altered permanently when these difficulties have been left behind us. But, in the meantime, we must not let our economic worries and fears cause us to bring about another one of those human tragedies which we can never justify—not to ourselves nor to the generations to follow.

I speak to you not only as a U.S. Senator, but as an Iowan whose culture and upbringing in Butler County, Iowa, were little different from my own in neighboring Black Hawk County. I speak to you with my heart and my soul and my intellect. I tell you that this drama of human events and human relationships that has been played out right here among us and not in a distant land, is more powerful than mere legislation.

Our debt to Indochina is unique. It is not the same as any debts we may have anywhere else in the world. We can and should use that as the reason to maintain and improve our Indochinese refugee program.

We cannot let any of the temporary, though difficult, economic situations in this country deter us from fulfilling our obligation.

This refugee program which saves the lives of Indochinese is a small program. The dollars it takes are few in comparison with the total expenditures of this country, even when we are curtailing government expenditures. To continue this program by providing the necessary funding, by approving a continued flow of Indochinese into the United States, will cause no adverse economic impact upon our citizens. Our economy is not suffering because of refugees.

My daily experiences lead me to believe that public support is greater than some of our elected officials realize. And I believe that, with the proper public education from the top levels of government public understanding, and support would grow even more.

I am trying to touch your heart and soul and intellect, so you will know the importance of displaying your courage in this matter, so you will choose to use that courage in taking some difficult positions and making some difficult decisions on this subject. It is my hope that you will come to feel the necessity to use your leadership abilities on the Refugee Subcommittee to persuade others to make human decisions with a minimum of political rationale.

I implore you to consider taking this matter as one of your personal issues as you serve in Washington. I know that what I ask is difficult for you, but I ask it nonetheless, for who else is there to ask? I ask you to consider devoting the time necessary to become the most knowledgeable Senator in the country on this issue. I

pledge to you any help you may request of me, including specific suggestions for ways in which to change the domestic program so it can be turned around in the eyes of the public.

Such a course of action would change our country. It already has, at least visually, because we see so many Indochinese faces all around us. You and I weren't used to that while we grew up in Iowa. But that kind of change is a surface thing.

The kind of change I'm talking about is the direction of something we are all striving for. Perhaps the inclusion of these people into our society will bring back for us some of the values we knew and prized in our childhood and youth: The values of family solidarity; the values of honesty and simplicity of living; the values which hold material possessions less high than personal characteristics; the value of patriotism as we once knew it.

I know a former Indochinese refugee, a man who has run from communism for 30 years, since he was a young boy. I saw him at his citizenship ceremony, where he said, with tears in his eyes, "At last I have a country to serve."

That's a value I'd like to bring back for my grandchildren. Perhaps the Indochinese can refresh for us what we have taken for granted, which may now be lost to our grandchildren. Let's try to recover it for them by exposing them to the attitudes of the newcomers. If our people have lost the ability to display these attitudes to our grandchildren, perhaps the Indochinese can.

Thank you.

Senator GRASSLEY. You are obviously going to have a difficult time convincing anybody—or a lot of people—that I've a soft spot in my heart.

Ms. SHEARER. I knew it. That's why I could say this. [Laughter.]

Senator GRASSLEY. I want to ask some questions now.

I forgot to introduce the counsel for the committee, that I hired in February, Ally Milder, originally from Omaha and now living in Washington, D.C.

I'd also like to introduce a friend of mine, State Representative Schroeder from Pottawattamie County, who just came in. We were in the Iowa Legislature for years and years, and he's still there, and sometimes I wish I were. I won't say that, now that I'm a Senator; but I sure did when I was a Member of the House of Representatives.

Let me start by asking you, Hank, what is the normal refugee admission rate at the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. CUSHING. As you know, we operate under annual ceilings. Arrival rates in any one month are a function of operations that have gone on overseas for several months before that. We do not go to the beaches and the camps and select the refugees in a certain month and have them arrive that month.

The admissions in September, at the close of the fiscal year, actually were about 20,800. But this was the culmination of activities going on for several months before that. Some of the refugees who arrived in September actually had been accepted for admission as many as 10 months before that, most of them between 5 and 8 months before that time.

There are always undulations in the arrival rates of refugees. We try to smooth them out to lessen the impact on voluntary agencies and local communities.

Sometimes, owing to things beyond our control, we are not able to smooth out that arrival rate. But overall, we would like to have people actually arrive in this country at an even monthly rate of about one-twelfth of the annual ceiling.

That was accomplished in fiscal year 1980, with small undulations. This past year we were not able to accomplish such an even rate, because of a number of circumstances. For example, we were not able to interview and process a group of Cambodians for many months. When finally the Thai Government and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees asked us to assist in taking out of the refugee camps those eligible for our program, we were obliged to do it rather suddenly, in the late winter of last year. Processing those people and moving them meant that we had a bulge in the program.

There was also an issue, that was brought up eloquently by Colleen a few minutes ago, of who is an economic migrant and who is a refugee, and are economic migrants eligible for our program?

Well, of course, an economic migrant is not eligible for the program. But, as Ms. Shearer put it, the Indochinese refugees are rarely economic migrants. I think this is quite evident.

But because there was an issue over this between agencies of the Federal Government, there were several months in the winter and spring when we had what we call a "deferral" problem; a number of people were not admitted in the ordinary stream of the admissions program for awhile while this issue was threshed out.

When it was resolved, they were free to go on with the admission process, and that led to this bulge. The admission rate jumped from the previous rate of 8,000 to 12,000 a month up to 20,000.

Senator GRASSLEY. What about the 5,000 that were determined eligible refugees by the Attorney General's staff?

Mr. CUSHING. Determined eligible or ineligible?

Senator GRASSLEY. Well, originally ineligible, but——

Mr. CUSHING. Well, this was the problem. Some of those people suspected of being economic migrants had been examined as far back as last December. That problem went on into the spring, all the way until May. Those people about whom there was a difference of opinion between State and Immigration and Naturalization Service officers were just set aside, as it were. When that issue was resolved, we could go ahead with their processing. And that added to the bulge later. Had the issue not arisen, or had it been resolved immediately then——

Senator GRASSLEY. That was the bulge back in September.

Mr. CUSHING [continuing]. Then the bulge wouldn't have come in September. It would have been smoothed out in the course of the year.

So we did have, indeed, an extraordinary number in September, but it was extraordinary for a number of reasons, dating from the past.

Senator GRASSLEY. Is the 5 to 8 months you were talking about the period of time that these people were in refugee camps, or what is the average period of time?

Mr. CUSHING. Well, some have been there literally for many years.

Senator GRASSLEY. Do you have an average?

Mr. CUSHING. No, sir, I do not.

Senator GRASSLEY. Is it possible to get that information?

Mr. CUSHING. No. I can say the bulk of the refugees who come in our program, into the United States, spend about 8 months to 1 year in a refugee camp. Of that time, about 6 months in the processing, leading to the actual arrival here in the United States.

Now, the processing is complex. It starts with interviews by voluntary agency personnel—people in this room have been part of that activity—an interview, or at least an examination of the file, by a State Department officer overseas; an examination by an INS officer; then certain security checks are made through cable traffic to Washington, D.C.

With final approval of the refugee to enter the United States, a search is made through a voluntary agency, to include Iowa, for sponsorship here in the United States. The search sometimes can take quite awhile, if there's an effort made to match up the refugee with a particular close associate, friend, or relative.

For many of the refugees, there is a 3½- to 4-month stay in a special camp in Southeast Asia, where they're taught English. This English-as-a-second language and cultural orientation program was only developed last year, in fiscal year 1981.

Senator GRASSLEY. What percentage of the people in refugee camps are participating in English language training?

Mr. CUSHING. First, it is only those selected for our program, not all refugees. Last year, approximately 40,000 refugees—counting both the students and their families—of our admissions of 130,000 for the whole year, benefited from this program.

But it began, as I said, only in the course of the year, and had to be developed as the year went along. It is now totally in place in Southeast Asia. Of this fiscal year's admissions, that we are able, through Presidential decision, to have an operational ceiling somewhere up to 100,000 Indochinese. The 80,000 include family members of the students who go through that 3 or more months English language, cultural orientation program.

We believe the program will benefit refugee resettlement here and result in a significant reduction in the cost of teaching English. It's much cheaper to teach refugees English overseas than in this country. Ten million dollars will accomplish this overseas in the course of this year.

Senator GRASSLEY. Why aren't the refugees provided with English language and orientation materials to take with them?

Mr. CUSHING. Now they are, sir. In the past——

Senator GRASSLEY. We thought they could just use them, but not take them with them.

Mr. CUSHING. The textbooks and other materials?

Senator GRASSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CUSHING. There is a cultural orientation booklet that they do take with them. We're looking at aids that they might take with them when they depart from the camp. These things are being studied now, as to what would be the most useful, and if it's economically feasible——

Senator GRASSLEY. Well, our Government supplies hundreds of millions of dollars through the UNHCR, and the money should be there for things like this. That's our feeling.

Mr. CUSHING. Yes; but over the past few years the UNHCR has been struggling just to meet the bare necessities of erecting camps, providing food, water, and so on, which has sometimes been a very difficult thing to do within the UNHCR budget.

We've insisted that the refugees should be provided some training while they are in camps. But first the UNHCR has to meet those critical needs. And the UNHCR is, after all, obliged to go to donor nations to get its money. It doesn't get its contributions by assessments from U.N. member nations. It is obliged to seek every dollar it needs from special contributions. So sometimes its budget is insufficient to do all these things.

Senator GRASSLEY. May I shift gears here for a minute and ask you if it is realistic to believe that the United States will someday admit the lower "normal flow" of only 50,000 refugees a year, as recommended by the Refugee Act of 1980?

Mr. CUSHING. I would like to say that ideally we would never have to take any refugees, because there wouldn't be any requiring resettlement outside the region where they first seek asylum.

To say that 50,000 will somehow be a norm is——

Senator GRASSLEY. That's the language——

Mr. CUSHING. That's the language in the act, but it's only effective through fiscal year 1982. It is under a sunset provision, and there is no normal number after this year of 50,000.

It was wishful thinking, but both the Congress and the administration once thought that a 50,000 normal-flow figure might be feasible, or a norm. Refugee problems are volatile, they emerge, they disappear, they emerge somewhere else.

To say that any specific number, any number, whatever—20, a million—is appropriate, is absolutely impossible. Each refugee situation has unique characteristics, and the need for U.S. resettlement varies, depending on those circumstances.

There are millions of refugees in Africa, but we do not say there's some norm of U.S. admissions for them, because for the most part, such refugees are able to have first asylum or to resettle in place, or to repatriate. There has been no pressure from Africa to admit them, though there've been some desires on the part of people in the United States, saying, "Well, why not admit Africans proportional to any other group?" And we say we're not admitting people because they're a particular racial group, we're admitting people because the situation seems to require it, because that particular humanitarian response is dictated, by circumstances.

Senator GRASSLEY. We're involved at that stage with the idea of helping and I would think that the people have the desire to return to their homeland, in the vast majority of instances.

Mr. CUSHING. I believe that the Indochinese would have preferred, absolutely, to have stayed there. You heard the letter quoted by Mrs. Shearer. I've heard others say this too.

Through years, centuries, of struggle, devastation, agricultural failures, floods, wars, they didn't leave that homeland. There wasn't the kind of oppression until the past half a dozen years that has led to this kind of exodus. They would prefer to be there. They

would prefer to stay in a camp, if they could safely stay in a camp, until the situation changed and they could go home.

Many people point particularly to the Lao refugees, and say, "Why don't they go back home? Why don't they go to some third country?"

They can't go home, because of the situation in their homeland. They are not seeking third-country resettlement. Thousands of Lao and Hmong refugees from Laos do not want to resettle in the United States or any other country. They want to go home if it is ever possible. And they stay there.

And that becomes part of a problem, because Thailand says, "We cannot afford this situation."

Senator GRASSLEY. Thank you Mr. Cushing. Ken, do you believe that the per capita grant to voluntary agencies is the most efficient way of compensating these agencies? And this question is asked in regard to the charges that this is simply an incentive to bring in as many refugees as possible in as short a time as possible.

Mr. QUINN. This is the State Department grant of an amount of money per each refugee?

Senator GRASSLEY. Yes.

Mr. QUINN. I'm not intimately familiar with that, but it's been my experience in the past that this has not been an undue incentive to agencies to bring in more refugees, just so they could be earning more money.

Many of the agencies involved—perhaps even most—in fact passed all or a good part of that money on to sponsors or to the refugees themselves, to help with initial resettlement costs.

I know that the Governor has felt that this small amount of money here has really been instrumental to us in getting sponsors and to making the sponsors feel comfortable with those initial first resettlement costs that they have to defray.

I know in my own instance, when I was a refugee sponsor in Washington, D.C., in 1975, we had 12 people that we were resettling, and that money was just—that was passed on to us by the U.S. Catholic Conference, was just essential in helping get started.

So I have not seen—the Federal Government determines how many refugees will come here, and I think that money probably is useful in getting the agencies to go out and find some sponsors.

Mr. CUSHING. If I could speak on that, Senator——

Senator GRASSLEY. Yes, feel free to.

Mr. CUSHING. I've watched this process over time. It began in 1975, with a $500 grant. But late in 1976, there was no money for a number of refugees who came in under the Indochinese refugee program, and the voluntary agencies helped resettle them without grants.

Then in early 1977, they started receiving only a $250 grant. That has moved back up, until today it's $525 per head. You must remember, that's called reception and placement grant, not resettlement. If the Federal Government were to try to provide reception and placement services for the refugees without the voluntary contributions that these organizations are able to generate through their churches and civic associations, it would cost us immensely more.

Senator GRASSLEY. So the figure is so low that it is not an incentive?

Mr. CUSHING. It is, I think, an inadequate figure, from my own view, sir. Not an incentive, but quite the opposite. In fact, it's a shortfall.

Ms. SHEARER. I think this issue arises because people are always debating, "Is it enough or is it not enough?" and perhaps the responsibilities must be defined before you can actually reach a conclusion as to the proper dollar amount.

One of my own theories, which many people debate, is that perhaps the voluntary agencies should be paid a certain amount to just get them here to this country, where then the sponsors provide the bridge between the resettlement and followup services.

As it is now, the contracts with the State Department require certain core services, and those are very flexible. And it is like shifting sands. How do you put a dollar amount to some of those?

So maybe they need to cut it off at a different point, and then they can assess the dollar amount better.

Mr. CUSHING. The contracts for the new fiscal year are in fact specifically called reception and placement. The services provided under the grant agreement would actually cost more than these grants. First, there is the sponsorship search. The agency itself is sponsoring, but they need associates—families, churches, and so on; it might better be called associate sponsorship search; the contracts also cover reception at final destination and housing, food, clothes, necessary spending money, some guidance and counseling, especially aimed at job search. The contract stipulates that services will be available to the refugee for 90 days. It is reception and placement.

The agencies, I should say, however, regard themselves as resettlement agencies, with a longer term responsibility. They do not throw the refugee out the door in 90 days and ignore him. They regard themselves just as the Iowa Center does. They're there to assist over time, and someday to assist that refugee when he adjusts his refugee of status to a permanent resident and, finally, to citizenship.

Senator GRASSLEY. Mr. Cushing, I'd like to have you comment on Colleen's feelings regarding the definition of refugee. That's the economic versus political matter. Can the State Department insure that those refugees undergoing repatriation from Thailand are doing so voluntarily, and are not in danger?

Mr. CUSHING. Well, first, sir, the economic versus the political refugee. As you are aware, the act says——

Senator GRASSLEY. Can I implore you to be concise, please? I've got a whole series of questions I've got to ask Dr. Burnett.

Mr. CUSHING [continuing]. A refugee is one who fears persecution on the grounds of political, religious, or racial identity or membership in a certain class. Economic migrants are unable to show such fear of persecution.

But economic privation—not the situation in which the person is economically deprived, but economic privation deliberately imposed on somebody as a political act—is very much what goes on in Communist nations, especially as they attempt to consolidate their power——

Senator GRASSLEY. Well, we know that goes on in Moscow, and——

Mr. CUSHING. Right. And we have refugees from Moscow.

Senator GRASSLEY. And the Jews want to enter——

Mr. CUSHING. Political persecution that has an economic manifestation.

Now, the refugee comes over, and sometimes he is unlettered. There are people among the Indochinese refugee population who are what we call preliterate—or from a group without a written language. A refugee might say, "I couldn't get a job. Food was short." Is he an economically deprived person, purely an economic migrant? Not at all—or not necessarily so. He couldn't get a ration card, because of his association in the past with the former government with which we had associations. He was suspect. His children cannot enter the schools. This is not simply a man without a job.

Senator GRASSLEY. I understand.

Mr. CUSHING. I can't insure that our program doesn't admit a few people who didn't care what government was there before, or what government is there now, but just heard there was a program, and they'd go and try to come to America. That may happen.

Senator GRASSLEY. Well, do those people now fit under that definition of refugees?

Mr. CUSHING. Yes, sir. If they are victims of political persecution, manifested by economics.

Now we have a decision—rather, an opinion—from the office of legal counsel, and it's been made available to the full committee. I have a copy of it here if you wish it, sir. It points out that if a person was economically deprived, but political persecution caused that economic privation, then he meets the definition.

Moreover, whatever his reasons for leaving, if he fears to go back because he will be persecuted he meets the definition in the act passed by Congress. That is, he might have thought, "This isn't so good here; I'm going to leave." His leaving is a political act in those countries. It is not simply a violation of exit procedures; he's not prosecuted if he goes back; he's persecuted.

Mr. QUINN. Senator, just two quick points:

As you know, I spent almost 6 years in Vietnam, studied the language and am familiar with what has gone on there.

One, after the Communist takeover in 1975, the whole population was categorized, and you have identification cards with different colors on them, indicating your different status. And these statuses that have been conferred, if you're in the lowest status, is going to pertain to all of your children for their future, for their children's children. And you're going to be in a political caste system, so that your children are not going to get into those schools.

And so somebody may arrive on the shores of Thailand and say, "I left because there wasn't any opportunity for my children." What it means is they have been politically categorized, and this is going to be a stigma that they will bear with them, just as a Jew might have had a star tattooed on his arm in Germany, and the implications that go with it.

The second is, if you've ever stood on the shores of South Vietnam and looked at the rickety boats, or been in one of those, and looked out into the South China Sea, and you realize that some-

body who gets into one of those boats and tries to swing and go on a week or 10-day trip around to Thailand, does so with a great deal of trepidation. They know all the stories of brutal attacks by Thai pirates, of the rape of the women, of murder at sea, of how many boats are lost with thousands of people in them.

And so someone getting onto one of those boats and going there, does so for more than a reason that they think they'll be able to get a better job.

Senator GRASSLEY. Thank you, Mr. Quinn. Dr. Burnett, given the new 67-percent dependency rates for Indochinese—how many refugees can your Department fund for fiscal year 1982?

Dr. BURNETT. I don't have the precise figure on that——

Senator GRASSLEY. Roughly.

Dr. BURNETT. However, the budget that was prepared, I understand was based on, what, a flow of about 173,000 and a dependency rate for the current year of about 49 percent. So this is somewhat above the level that we had aniticipated. This is the rate that would be built into the budget for fiscal year 1983.

I don't have the number, but this would certainly mean that there's going to be a variation here, but I don't——

Senator GRASSLEY. What plans are underway to reduce the refugee dependency rate? And I know in your statement you refer to the fact that you're trying to take the best of the Iowa program and, where applicable, try to impress upon people in other States to follow that.

Dr. BURNETT. Yes.

Senator GRASSLEY. But beyond that general statement?

Dr. BURNETT. This region—I might open by responding in this fashion: This region, as of the most recent data we have, has an average dependency rate of about 41 precent. And over the last 5 years this rate nationally has been increasing at between 4 and 5 percent per annum, but it's accelerating now.

There are two or three things that I think will impact this:

One is the imposition of the 36-month limitation, which is a statutory limitation. It says that after the end of 36 months the refugees will no longer be eligible for refugee funds; that is, through the Office of Refugee Resettlement. We're currently looking at several options right now that we are confident will impact the future.

The options are involved with these kinds of things:

The rate at which benefits will be made available, and the length of time that these benefits will be made available.

Secretary Schweiker, I understand, will receive either this week or next a set of options from our headquarters people that will talk about things like, perhaps it would be best if a refugee—and this is, again, we should remember, for the non-AFDC or the nonmedicaid, or those people who are categorically related that I mentioned earlier—single adults, childless couples—that they would be eligible for benefits, let's say, at the standard AFDC level for 1 year, then drop down to 50 percent for the second year. This is one of the options. And no benefits the third year.

Another possibility is for a State that has an acceptable general assistance program, that this might run for 18 months and then drop down to a lower level, or that it might run for the full 36 months at a reduced level.

These kinds of things we believe will result in savings, at least to the refugee program, of somewhere between an estimated $30 to $75 million during the course of a fiscal year.

We think it's important that these benefits be retained that first year at the full level, because the rationale that puts them there in the first place still holds. These people are in need of assistance, and that's the time when they need it the most. But we think it shouldn't be continued for as long as it has been in the past.

Senator GRASSLEY. Well, you answered my third question, so I"ll go on to the fourth one.

Last month HHS testified in Washington that they're going to give more authority to regional offices, in this area. How do you expect this statement to affect your operations in region VII?

Dr. BURNETT. It's unclear to us just now what this is going to do to——

Senator GRASSLEY. You are aware of the directive.

Dr. BURNETT. Yes, sir.

Senator GRASSLEY. What direction they're moving?

Dr. BURNETT. Yes. Dr. Phillip Hawkes, who is the director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement, has made this statement.

Senator GRASSLEY. You don't know whether that's going to increase your role as it relates to the Iowa program and other refugee resettlement programs in your region?

Dr. BURNETT. We've been informed that regional offices are going to play a more significant role. At this time, I don't know what that would be.

Senator GRASSLEY. All right. My next question:

Under the Refugee Act of 1980, in order to receive Federal funds, States were required to submit resettlement plans by October 1, 1980. How do you think the Iowa plan compared to other States' plans?

Dr. BURNETT. Superior.

Senator GRASSLEY. Do you think that those States which are experiencing problems in refugee programs—that is, high-impact areas, and those where the refugee population is heavily dependent on welfare, need to revamp their resettlement programs?

Dr. BURNETT. I think there needs to be another look at the highly impacted areas. We're attempting to help States do this through some targeted resettlement in a cooperative endeavor. This is applying to Cambodians that are entering now. And in identifying some areas where clustered resettlement can take place, to guide them away from the heavily impacted cities and counties that are experiencing overloads on their systems just now.

Also in the heavily impacted areas, mutual assistance associations are being encouraged to try to spell it out more precisely to incoming refugees, new arrivals: "Here are the pros and here are the cons. Here are the problems that we're experiencing here, and maybe it would be better if you were to go to another location."

I don't know what kind of success we'll have in that.

Mr. QUINN. One of the complaints that you hear from States is that—particularly States that have impacted areas—is that they don't know when and how many refugees are going to be coming, and where they're going to be placed. States would like to have the ability to deal with the voluntary agencies beforehand, and be able

to say to them, "Don't resettle anymore people here; we've got problems; we can't handle anymore; instead, why don't you resettle them over here?"

Anything that can be done in terms of either the State Department contracts with the voluntary agencies, or in your deliberations, to insure that greater cooperation and communication takes place in that regard, would be of immense value and greatly appreciated by all the States.

Senator GRASSLEY. Dr. Burnett, my last question to you is:

What did the Office of Refugee Resettlement learn from this fiscal year 1981 national demonstration project about planning and management in the domestic program, refugee involvement and self sufficiency, in providing effective English, job development and support services?

Dr. BURNETT. We have done some surveys—a national survey, in fact, just this last 4 or 5 months—that indicated that the social service dollars that were made available and support particularly ESL programs and those programs that surround, cluster around jobs and employment, were very worthwhile; that these things do make a difference.

Problems that we encounter in these kinds of assessments, however, are the same kinds of things that one might encounter in looking at a school system, say. You know, "How good is this school system, and how good are these services?"

One question that comes to mind is: How good as compared to what? And one must also consider the kinds of people, the kinds of refugees in this instance, where they come from, the aptitudes, the skills they bring with them. In comparing one program with another, it's really quite different. For instance, in a program where we're working with among people as opposed to another group that may, by virtue of the accident of where they grew up and what they did, have developed different kinds of skills, more salable skills. We're getting an increasing body of worthwhile information in this regard, but it's one of the things that we need to work on diligently.

Senator GRASSLEY. Colleen, do you believe that Iowa's system of resettling people through the State employment service rather than the welfare office could be successfully adopted by other States, especially those with high welfare dependency rates? And if your answer to that is positive, should such an approach be mandatory through changing the legislation?

Ms. SHEARER. I think it's possible, keeping in mind something that I think probably Dr. Burnett mentioned earlier—someone did, at any rate—the history of those other States.

You're going to be taking something away from somebody and giving something to somebody else, and that's always a turf battle.

Except for those problems, yes, it could certainly be done. The State governmental structures are enough alike one another.

Should it be mandated? I think it might be too early to mandate that, but it's not too early to have it fully and deeply explored by the heads of the—the Cabinet people in Washington, Department of Labor, Department of HHS, along with the U.S. Coordinator. Somebody at high levels. You cannot have those decisions made in the middle of the bureaucracy.

Ultimately, I think it would be a fine mandate.

Senator GRASSLEY. In reviewing your June 17, 1981 plan, which provides an approach for resettling approximately 300,000 refugees in 2 years, I see that you call for substantial increases in the refugee population in areas where that population density is relatively low at the present time.

If we adopted this plan, how would the particular locality be able to absorb such an increase? For example, you propose an increase of New York refugee population by 37,681.

Ms. SHEARER. I should explain to you, that particular paper, perhaps by the time it was reviewed by your staff, the attachment was no longer there. I drew that up one night at the office when all offices were closed, and I had no access to statistics. It was only working with unemployment statistics and population figures, and there are a lot of other factors that have to be included.

I did it as an example of how planning could take place in this country, looking at work force projections, looking at existing work forces, looking at the types of industry, looking at the unemployment statistics.

I merely meant it as a way in which you can factor those things in. Nobody has done that yet. And the 300,000; I was surprised. I thought, "Well, how do you like that?" I just figured these out, and came up with 300,000. It was not an attempt to State a certain number of refugees.

By the same theory, I got some other statistics that indicate theoretically in this country there are sponsorships by the thousands going to waste across this country. Theoretically, if you use church congregations, every church congregation in this country taking one family of an average size of five, you could resettle 1,600,000 overnight. And, again, that's theoretical, merely to show that sponsors are out there; like I'm trying to show here, that these factors need to be included in the planning of where the refugees go.

Senator GRASSLEY. Once those refugees are resettled in a location, such as New York, what will prevent them from relocating in other impacted areas?

Ms. SHEARER. I think you need to go back to the basic statements of this country of what it's going to deliver to refugees, the initial concept, if you will, between the country and the refugee coming in.

There will be people who will say United Nations statements on civil rights would not permit this. I question whether or not someone has civil rights in this country before they arrive here.

And what I'm saying from the beginning is, a negotiated contract, if you will, saying, "We will allow you entry into this country if you live up to this part of the bargain; which is, you must stay with this sponsor in this location for a certain length of time and until and unless you are able to move yourself financially, with your own financing, stay where you are."

It requires more planning in deciding, then, where they're going to go initially.

Senator GRASSLEY. What is your position on the proposal to reduce 100 percent reimbursement by the Federal Government of State expenditures for refugee support?

Ms. SHEARER. What is my proposal on that?

Senator GRASSLEY. What's your position?

Ms. SHEARER. Oh. My position is that I've been waiting a long time for cuts in the dollar amounts, because I think they're needed.

To go across the board in the hopes of achieving some kind of equity, it will, in fact, create some other kinds of inequities. For instance, the continuation of single grants is an inequity. Americans cannot draw single grants; that is, a family without children cannot draw under the Aid to Dependent Children program.

So I think they should cut some categories completely, and then we could live, certainly, with a 50 percent cut. I could not like to see a 50 percent cut from the very first few months they were here.

Mr. QUINN. You're talking about a 50 percent cut in dollar amounts, but not in the amounts reimbursable?

Ms. SHEARER. Yes. A 100 percent reimbursable, but the amount the refugee receives could well be 50 percent of what it is. It need not necessarily follow what's being done through the normal ADC program in a State.

Mr. QUINN. In 1979, when the Congress had hearings on the 1980 Refugee Act, Governor Ray appeared before Congresswoman Holtzman's committee at that time, and also before Senator Kennedy, chairing the Judiciary Committee on this. And it was our feeling at the time that, all the considerations involved, that we had a compact with the Federal Government, that it would continue for 3 years to provide 100 percent reimbursable; and we would hope that that would be able to be continued.

Mr. CUSHING. Perhaps, sir, the issue should be put in these terms:

Since it is a national program to admit refugees, there's a national obligation to assist the States for some period. But the underlying issue, I think, is: Are we trying to give the refugees a leg up—which was the thinking behind the provisions in the Refugee Act—or are we trying to give them some economic status in America?

If we would stop thinking of refugee assistance as welfare, but as something else—a small, short-term boost into America, then it's very appropriate that we nationally fund whatever State the refugee happens to live in.

But we should not allow it to be thought of as a welfare issue; and that's what it has become. These are people with a work ethic, believe me, sir. The refugees view this as, "You have invited us to use this; you've invited us, and now you are complaining that it's costing money. What is it you really want us to do?"

Well, I think we have to define what we want them to do: Go to work and be self-sufficient. But that message has to be put across to them in the right way. Right now he would regard himself as stupid if he did not take advantage of what people are insisting that he take.

Senator GRASSLEY. From that standpoint, though, in a very real sense, we've invited people who have lived their entire lives in this country on those same programs, too.

Ms. SHEARER. We just think it's unfortunate the same thing happened to the refugees, because it has destroyed some of their work ethic.

Senator GRASSLEY. In other words, the mistakes that were made for American citizens, should not be made for the refugees.

Ms. SHEARER. Yes. We're asking you to reverse it, because the mistake has already been made.

Senator GRASSLEY. So maybe we ought to undo the mistake.

Ms. SHEARER. Yes, that's right.

Mr. QUINN. Our feeling has always been that we should tighten up the criteria so that people who don't deserve to have these moneys shouldn't be getting them. Make them go to work. But for those who really need them, that to cut it off too soon——

Ms. SHEARER. There'll be money left over for those who really need it.

Mr. QUINN. Yes—they'll end up down at Polk County or someplace else in search of help, because they can't make it.

Mr. CUSHING. There cannot be an endless series of alternatives, where if this door is shut in front of him he just goes next door. And that's what will happen.

The refugees are intelligent people. If they didn't go from door to door to see who was opening the door and offering them something, it would be stupid; and they're not stupid.

I think there has to be a single source of assistance. It cannot be thought of in terms of welfare, but what was really behind the Refugee Act in 1980—that there are certain special needs that a person brought out of a terrible situation has, in coming to grips with this society. But it has to be laden with incentives to do what the refugee really wants to do—become a citizen of this country and a contributor to it.

Dr. BURNETT. It seems to be also, sir, that it's important that refugees develop realistic expectations early in the game. I think somewhere along the line—and this happens early on in some instances—an expectation is developed that, "Well, it's going to be a free ride," and if anything happens that alters that, then we're in a bigger problem than we certainly would have been in had the expectation been realistic and well focused, insofar as the kind of financial support the refugee would receive upon arriving here.

Senator GRASSLEY. Colleen, that's all the questions I have of you.

One general question, according to testimony given by the Department of Health and Human Services before this Senate Immigration Subcommittee on September 22, in Washington, D.C., cash and medical assistance available to refugees was budgeted at $441 million. That amount rose to $462 million in the 1982 budget.

On the other hand, the amount budgeted for social services declined from $85 million in 1981 to $70 million in 1982.

According to the testimony, these figures reflected the expected decline in the refugee numbers. If our goal is to make refugees here self sufficient, thereby encouraging them to contribute to our country's economic system rather than causing a drain on the system, why are we allocating more funds to cash assistance, the sector which is commonly believed to provide a disincentive to productivity?

And then a followup: Wouldn't the more sound approach be to create more funds for social services programs, such as English and vocational training, leading quickly to self sufficiency and economic growth for our country?

Dr. BURNETT. I suppose that, in a way, those of us who work with the refugee program are reluctant to see reductions on either

track. We think that reductions in cash and medical that can be introduced as a result of some of the things we're talked about, are certainly appropriate; or those that are tied to the flow make sense.

But for arriving refugees, that cash and medical assistance initially is extremely important. We would hate to see that reduced below reasonable limits in order that social services might be increased.

But what really concerns us is what has happened to some degree with the budget for fiscal year 1982, in that the social services—almost like the branch of a tree—are viewed as being those things out at the end of the branch, and they're the most easily clipped; while, as you so well point out, these are the things that help refugees escape from the need for cash and medical help.

So we have a concern about this. We very much hate to see social services cut, because those are the propellers, the impellers, that get people out and on their own.

Ms. SHEARER. I agree with what he says. Those are investment dollars.

But I'd like to throw in, too: Has anyone considered block-granting the cash-medical money into the States, and letting the States adjust to their own refugee problems, because they are different from State to State?

Senator GRASSLEY. Well, I haven't, specifically. But I'll bet David Stockman has. [Laughter.]

And maybe—you know, I'm a believer in block grants and maybe some in the room don't like my philosophy on that, but maybe we ought to look into it.

Ms. SHEARER. We feel that there are some things that we could be doing in Iowa that maybe wouldn't be appropriate in other States, and——

Senator GRASSLEY. Well, do you think you could spend the money more efficiently and effectively, and yet——

Ms. SHEARER. With, we believe, few dollars; yes.

Senator GRASSLEY [continuing]. With fewer dollars, if it were block-granted?

Ms. SHEARER. Yes, because we'd have eliminated the single grant, and that would have saved a lot of money.

Senator GRASSLEY. Well, I'm glad you brought that out, you may have talked to me privately.

Ms. SHEARER. No; I just keep sending you things.

Senator GRASSLEY, Well now we'll have it in the record.

Ken, or Mr. Cushing, do you want to comment on this last question before we dismiss the panel?

Mr. CUSHING. Only to this point: From my perspective, I would like to see medical assistance available to the refugees—Medicare—even it they are moving toward self-sufficiancy. The loss of eligibility is a disincentive to going to work. And some means has got to be found to keep medical assistance, even as the refugee takes his entry-level job and marches forward. He shouldn't lose medicare because he is no longer receiving cash assistance. because then the bargain in his life—and he's intelligent enough to see it—is to stop the work.

Ms. SHEARER. We see that every day.

Senator GRASSLEY. Well, again, that's a problem for American citizens; and it's one that, with some changes in the law, is going to affect a few thousand people even in Iowa. A few thousand in Iowa, and many thousands around the country.

Ms. SHEARER. If the two were separated—the medical money from the cash assistance money—you would not have people then quitting their jobs so they could avail themselves of the medical help because medical costs are escalating so rapidly. We see that every day, that they don't—They want to work, but they won't because——

Senator GRASSLEY. Well, then I suppose you'd have the problem of having the working poor, as a matter of fairness, be immediately eligible for medicaid.

Ms. SHEARER. I'd suggest that it not be medicaid. It could be refugee assistance money in a special health program for a certain period of time, administered, ideally, by the State health department, with nothing to do with cash assistance for a living.

Senator GRASSLEY. I want too thank you all, especially you, Mr. Cushing, once again, for responding to my plea to come to Iowa. I understand you're going to visit the Iowa program this afternoon. Colleen says she has a very busy schedule for you.

I thank you very much for responding to that request. And, once again, I want to thank you, Dr. Burnett, for your very expert testimony and obviously—the excellent program you're running in the Midwest area, or else you have good State agencies that are responding accordingly.

Thank you, Mr. Quinn, for representing the governor, and particularly I want to say that it makes me feel good in Washington, D.C., to come from a State where we have a Governor that's responsive at least in the area of refugee assistance and solving railroad problems, which are just two programs I think of off the top of my head—Iowa has unique programs that are looked to by Federal officials as ones for duplication in other States; and we all know about his leadership, but I think I ought to express it publicly, that he has some unique programs that are well respected around the country.

Colleen, your leadership in this area is obvious. I don't have to comment on it.

Thank you all very much.

On our second panel, we have with us representatives of the volunteer agencies who do a large portion of the refugee resettlement in the State of Iowa.

Ms. Kathy Harpster, Sister Pat Scherer, and Mr. Wayne Johnson.

Ms. Harpster is from the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, a national organization which settles largely Eastern European and Russian Jews, but that has also participated in Southeast Asia resettlement.

Sister Pat is representing the Catholic Council for Social concern, but she is part of the national resettlement effort of the United States Catholic Conference, a major refugee resettlement organization.

And Mr. Wayne Johnson is here on behalf of the Lutheran Social Service of Iowa, and serves as a consultant to that organization. I

90-377 O—82——4

understand that he's spent many years in Southeast Asia, and I look forward to hearing his testimony on the subject of resettlement, as I look forward to hearing from Ms. Harpster and Sister Pat.

I would like to have you proceed, if you would, in the way that I introduced you.

STATEMENT OF KATHY HARPSTER, REPRESENTATIVE OF THE HEBREW IMMIGRANT AID SOCIETY

Ms. HARPSTER. Senator Grassley, thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak here today. At your request of keeping it to 5 minutes, I tried to do a quick editing job of my presentation, so I'll try to keep within the 5 minutes.

The Jewish community's longstanding commitment to refugee resettlement was born out of necessity, the necessity to provide a home for people fleeing from persecution.

In 1880, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society was formed. At that time the organization provided meals, transportation, and employment counseling to refugees arriving at New York's Castle Garden, the major immigrant processing center.

By 1904 HIAS had its representatives on Ellis Island. The organization assisted new arrivals scheduled for deportation, as well as helping arrivals to locate family members in the United States.

HIAS has become, since then, an international agency which has assisted in the migration of people from Europe, Egypt, North Africa, Cuba, Chile, and Indochina. Since 1954 that organization has assisted in the resettlement of more than 248,000 individuals.

On the local level, the Jewish community in Des Moines has also felt an obligation to involve itself in resettlement. The first Jewish charity organization was organized in 1874 by a few women of the then new temple B'nai Yeshuran. This organization involved itself with providing food and clothing to newly arrived immigrants.

In the early 1920's, Federated Jewish Charities was involved with providing assistance to European relatives of Des Moines residents as well as resettlement of new Americans here. Federated Jewish Charities became Jewish Family Services, of which I am a part. This agency and its umbrella organization, the Jewish Federation of Greater Des Moines, have carried on the mandate of providing assistance to those seeking refuge from oppression and deprivation.

Since April of 1974, Jewish Family Services has resettled 43 families, representing approximately 175 people from the Soviet Union. Additionally, we have participated in resettling refugees from Southeast Asia and recently, from Afghanistan.

The following have been defined as Jewish Family Services' primary objectives regarding resettlement:

At least one member of each family unit will be employed within 20 weeks of arrival.

By the end of 20 weeks, a family will no longer need financial aid for housing or food.

Sufficient fluency in English for an essential, minimal level of communicating will be achieved after 6 months to 1 year; although

here we're interested in an ongoing process and, typically, several years are required.

Within 1 year a family unit will have overcome the major stresses of cultural shock that occur when a whole new way of life must be learned.

Our resettlement work begins when we accept a family referred to us by HIAS. The primary reason for acceptance is family reunification. Our agency staff is responsible for locating an apartment and providing the basic necessities for the family, as they leave the Soviet Union with little. We attempt to utilize donations to the greatest extent possible.

After the family arrives, our priority for them is English language training, as it is our philosophy that a proficiency in English will greatly enhance the ability to be self-sufficient and productive.

After approximately 3 months of language classes, the vocational worker assists the new arrival in securing employment.

Our work with the family continues after job placement. We have recently instituted a 4-month post-placement meeting with the employer to assess the progress of the refugee and to handle any problems, should they arise.

Another caseworker is responsible for assisting in securing the necessary documents here in the United States, and in securing whatever medical and dental care are necessary.

We also assist in enrolling the children in school or day care, which we feel is an important part of the acculturation process.

The one area of resettlement I have not yet discussed is acculturation. As all of us who are involved with resettlement know, acculturation, or becoming "Americanized" is an ongoing, complicated, sometimes painful process every refugee must go through.

For those of us within the national Jewish community involved in resettlement of Russians, we are now learning to deal with what has been termed the second stage of resettlement. The first stage is concerned with the assistance needed to enable the refugee to become employed and self-sufficient. After, at the most, 2 years, the people here in Des Moines have normally achieved these goals.

At this point, the need to become part of the fabric of American life becomes greater. The agency attempts to arrange for social contacts through religious events, as well as recreational opportunties. One way we provide opportunities for these contacts is through 1 year's membership in the synagogues and the Bureau of Jewish Living, which is the agency that provides cultural and educational experiences for the community.

Until 1978, the resettlement program was funded totally by the Des Moines Jewish community. Since that time the funding has been shared between the Jewish community and a Federal block grant. At this time, the Federal grant provides 45 percent of the costs, and the community makes up the rest.

One of the terms for participating in this grant is that the communities avoid using local services funded by the Federal Government. Therefore, this resettlement program must rely almost totally on its own resources.

As I'm sure you know, Senator, officially sponsored anti-Semitism has been on the rise in the Soviet Union for well over a decade. Athough anti-Semitism has been a serious problem in that

country ever since the days of the czars, the Soviet Government itself has embarked on a campaign of anti-Jewish descrimination in education and employment, in religious life and in cultural expression.

For Jews, each year brings progressively fewer career opportunities and increasingly harsher pressures. Physical harassment and jailing of Jewish activists are widespread. These are the circumstances that have led many Jews to seek exit from the Soviet Union.

As you said earlier, emigration from the Soviet Union involves a long and complicated process, requiring courage as well as endurance. The initial step in applying for exit has been to present a letter of invitation from abroad. In almost all Jewish cases, this invitation has come from Israel.

Until recently, such an invitation could come from any relative. The applicant is also required to furnish an extensive series of documents, requiring an exhausting and often frustrating confrontation with the Soviet bureaucracy.

In some cities, Jews have been obliged to present statements from every major commercial enterprise in the city that they have no outstanding debts.

When a Jew applies for emigration, he often is fired from his job or demoted to a menial position. Pressure is applied on relatives to discourage the applicant. In numerous cases, aged parents of adult would-be emigrants have been pressured to refuse permission to their children to leave the country.

Moreover, the decisions on applications may take up to a year or more. A Jew who seeks to quit the Soviet Union must subject himself to this arduous and frequently dangerous process, without any guarantee that he will, in fact, be granted permission. Soviet Jews who apply to emigrate must also renounce their Soviet citizenship—a costly process in itself.

These restrictions have been particularly effective in reducing Jewish emigration, since the majority of the 150,000 Soviet Jews now living in Israel arrived there during the early 1970's and have already invited members of their immediate families. Thus, they do not constitute a fruitful source of invitations for Jews still in the Soviet Union.

The new requirements diminish and frequently eliminate their chances of being reunited with family members.

Because of these restrictions, only 21,472 Soviet refugees arrived in Vienna in 1980, as compared with 51,294 in 1979.

Future developments in Soviet Jewish emigration are difficult to predict, because of the many factors that may influence Soviet policy in this area. It is generally believed, however, that relations between Washington and Moscow play a major role in determining Soviet readiness to grant exit permission to Jews.

It is the firm belief of Jewish Family Services and the Jewish Federation that the United States, as consistent with the country's earliest principles and the visions of our forefathers, will continue to be a haven for all those fleeing from tyranny and authoritarian regimes.

Senator GRASSLEY. Thank you.

I think we'll proceed as we did the last time, hear from all the panelists, and then I have questions that I'll ask each one of you.

Would you like to go ahead, Sister Pat?

STATEMENT OF SISTER PATRICIA SCHERER, REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CATHOLIC COUNCIL FOR SOCIAL CONCERN

Sister PATRICIA. Good morning, Senator. I am sister Patricia Scherer, and I am here on behalf of the Catholic Council for Social Concern, commonly called Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Des Moines. We thank you for this opportunity, Senator, to share with you personally our response to your agenda issues.

For the past 6 years, I have been involved with the refugee resettlement program at Catholic Council for Social Concern. I began as a sponsor in 1975, and then volunteered for 2 years while I continued to teach high school; and, finally, in 1977, I was hired as an outreach worker and have been on the staff at Catholic Council for the past 4 years.

The first question: The need for effective refugee resettlement programs, including the international aspect of refugee resettlement.

The resettlement programs of the four Catholic Dioceses of Iowa—Des Moines, Dubuque, Davenport, and Sioux City—are a continuing witness of the importance that the Catholic tradition has placed upon a response to the plight of refugees around the world since the thirties, when the U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops first established an office.

In the midsixties, Catholic Council for Social Concern resettled Cuban refugees. I think you spoke about that in your own presentation.

Again, in 1975, at the request of the U.S. Bishops, we began to resettle Southeast Asians. Since then, our staff of five persons, with the help of American sponsors or refugee sponsors, have resettled some 2,006 Southeast Asians, plus 19 Cubans and 2 Afghans in our diocese, which is the southwest 23 counties of Iowa.

Based on our Catholic tradition of openness to all cultures, we have chosen to sponsor all people designated by immigration officials as refugees or asylum applicants with work authorization. This broad scope of sponsorship is supported by other private VOLAGS in the State of Iowa. If our resettlement efforts are to be effective, we need to broaden our services to include all refugees and asylum applicants. By this, we mean to include Cubans, Afghans, El Salvadorans, Poles, Ethiopians, et cetera. If refugee resettlement is narrowed and designed for certain ethnics only, the benefits we could reap from other cultures will be lost in Iowa, and people will not be served.

In conversations with many refugees, most testify to the fact that the United States is the No. 1 choice of refugees in the camps. Freedom, education, and job opportunities are the main reasons for the tremendous desire to come to America.

We would hope, Senator, that we can count on your leadership and your continued support for adequately funded programs for all refugees and asylum applicants. In this way, you can help us make

Iowa a place to grow in freedom, in education, and in job opportunities for our latest arrivals—refugees of all nations.

Iowa's resettlement program and why it is successful.

The resettlement program in Iowa has been uniquely successful because of the broad participation of private VOLAGS and State involvement in the resettlement process. Gov. Robert Ray's support is a part of Iowa's success story.

Two other reasons for success must be pointed out, and should not be overlooked or underestimated:

The refugees and asylum applicants themselves. We now have from 1 to 5 years' experience of the refugees in our diocese. We have seen a quality of leadership which has formed communities; we have seen the integration of the refugees into our American culture while trying to preserve some of their traditional ways; we have seen their willingness to share their homes, food, and money with other refugees in need; we have seen their strong family structures and their respect for older persons; we have seen their young people and educated people interpret for those who do not speak well; we have seen their giftedness in art, dance, and song; and we have seen their faith in themselves, in us, in Buddha's way and in Jesus Christ.

When we started in 1975, we thought we were at risk in sponsoring these refugees. We now know by experience that this was not the case at all. Each nation that comes continues to amaze us with all the gifts they bring and are willing to share.

The people of Iowa: For the past 5 years, as you well know, Senator, and as all of us know, the people of Iowa have opened their minds and hearts to the plight of refugees around the world. Many Catholic churches in our diocese have sponsored refugee families since 1975. Now, for the first time, spirits seem to be dampened around sponsorship of refugees due to a more fearful attitude brought on by recession, inflation, and a general loss of confidence. However, the great majority of Iowans continue to support the refugee program.

So now, Senator, more than ever, we need your leadership to speak out in behalf of refugees who have much to contribute to our country and to help shape the minds and hearts of the people of Iowa to continue their generous efforts in behalf of these people.

Local and Federal funding of resettlement programs.

The majority of money for resettlement by our agency comes from the Federal Government, channeled through the U.S. Catholic Conference. This Federal money cannot be replaced by any local source of funds. These Federal moneys, channeled through our agency, allow us to develop programs according to our philosophy of refugee resettlement. Our philosophy is very person orientated. We help the refugees to become self-sufficient households as soon as they are able. We feel job training and English classes are extremely important to the future quality of life that the refugee can attain.

For example, some refugees can go to work immediately after arriving; others need time and help to acquire English and skills for a job.

Our experience indicates to us that not only must each family be served individually, but also that each person is unique and requires individual services according to their needs.

The U.S. Catholic Conference has designed an English language and cultural orientation program which is currently in operation in the Philippines for the refugees coming through our agency. Mr. Hank Cushing talked about that earlier. That's the program he's talking about, the ESL and the cultural program. Refugees coming through this program seem far more adaptive culturally and are speaking some English.

This is not in my written testimony, but we are experiencing now people coming from the program, and we are really—it's really a good program. They seem far more knowledgeable about what living in America is all about; and also, they're speaking English. And we are really happy about that.

Senator GRASSLEY. Let me parenthetically ask a question here, inasmuch as you referred to Mr. Cushing. Am I right on the English training, that that's done in the refugee camps, before they come to our country? I'm asking you, Ally, and then I'll ask her a question.

Ms. MILDER. I thought they had programs here, and they also had some in the refugee camps, that are federally funded. Is that correct? I don't know.

Senator GRASSLEY. Is your English training funded from that same pot of money that I was talking about, that funds the programs in the refugee camps for English training?

Sister PATRICIA. OK. Let me say it how I know it, Senator. I——

Senator GRASSLEY. Do you get any funds at all?

Sister PATRICIA. OK. We're getting—It's United States Catholic Conference funds that run the Philippine ESL and cultural program. Does that answer it? I'm not aware—are there other cultural programs going on, like in Thailand?

Senator GRASSLEY. Well, that was part of my presumption, in the question that I asked him.

Sister PATRICIA. I think there—I'm not going to know the exact locations. I'm familiar with the one in the Philippines that USCC is running, through Federal funds.

Senator GRASSLEY. Well, I also got the——

Sister PATRICIA. It sounds like he knows something that I don't. [Referring to Mr. Johnson.]

Mr. JOHNSON. There's also a program that is funded through moneys, U.S. moneys, given to the UNHCR, that's contracted to the Center for Applied Linguistics. This is done in Thailand.

Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service also runs and orientation and ESL program in Hong Kong. These are subcontracted, if you will, with U.S. Government funding, for the most part.

Senator GRASSLEY. But you also have some of these English programs in the United States that are right here in Iowa, right? In southwest Iowa, that you were referring to?

Sister PATRICIA. No, Senator, we do not run ESL programs, directly through our agency.

Senator GRASSLEY. Oh, you're talking about the U.S. Catholic Conference?

Sister PATRICIA. I'm talking about the U.S. Catholic Conference one in the Philippines, but——

Senator GRASSLEY. Oh; OK.

Sister PATRICIA. But my point is, the benefit of having them trained over there is really excellent, an excellent use of moneys. And it also helps us with jobs, because they're speaking English, and they have some idea of what kind of—they were told over there all about the work opportunities. You know, otherwise, just coming directly from the camp, you know, to getting off the plane and saying, you know, "This is where you're going to work," and not knowing anything about the person, or they knowing anything about what it means to go to work, you know, and what kind of work to do. So——

Senator GRASSLEY. OK. Please proceed.

Sister PATRICIA. OK. We just want to ask, you know, that you help us with the Federal funding. We're not going to be able to take over the programs, although some of the money is generated in the Catholic community and by the United Way Agency.

But the Federal funds in refugee resettlement come through the Federal Govenment, so we feel that the best use of Federal funds is to channel the moneys through the private VOLAGS already established and in resettlement work.

Thank you.

Senator GRASSLEY. You used a little bit of the psychology of Colleen. You asked my assistance and help. I've never been unfriendly to the program. I guess I've been kind of—my starting point has been to have the United States participate, but I think that we should use our muscle on the international scene, first of all, to create an atmosphere so that there are no refugee problems. Then assuming that that's all right, then if there are refugee problems—and it's obvious there always have been and always will be—that we don't try to assume responsibility in total, by ourselves, but through the international organizations and through bilateral diplomatic contacts, that we get other free nations to absorb part and, hopefully, their fair share of the group, so that the problem isn't a totally U.S. one to respond to.

Sister PATRICIA. May I make a response?

Senator GRASSLEY. Yes.

Sister PATRICIA. Part of the thing is that the refugees in the camps want to come to the United States, because they see us as the most free country in the world. I know for a fact that many of the refugees are refusing to go to other countries, because I've been told by refugees that they refuse to go to other countries when the opportunity comes for their interview. And if they do that, it means they have to go way back to the bottom of the list in the camp again, to come up in the U.S. list.

But the reason—it's hard to fault them on the reason they're doing this, which is because they know that that's the best way to go, is to go to America.

And so it's complicated. But I do agree that other nations should take responsibility.

Senator GRASSLEY. Well, philosophically—just so I know if you and I are on the same wavelength—philosophically, you aren't opposed to some limit; I mean——

Sister PATRICIA. Oh, no. No, Senator. And obviously the Southeast Asians are related to us, and—maybe I can speak a little about the Cubans later. There's a relationship between us and Cuba, and Southeast Asia and us, and right now, the Poles and us.

Senator GRASSLEY. Yes.

Sister PATRICIA. So there's certain crises in the world of—certain nations in the world that have relationships to the United States that really want to come here, for some obvious reason—anticommunism. You know, some of the refugees do not wish to go to France, because they're afraid that——

Senator GRASSLEY. Well, the other side of the coin is that there are some well-meaning people in America that just consider, you know, any unlimited number that want to come here, we ought to absorb.

Sister PATRICIA. No. We have to be reasonable, within reason.

Senator GRASSLEY. Thank you. Mr. Johnson?

STATEMENT OF WAYNE JOHNSON, REGIONAL CONSULTANTS FOR REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT, LUTHERAN SOCIAL SERVICE OF IOWA

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you, Senator.

Since I've been in the resettlement end of things for only 7 weeks now, I don't feel that I can address, with any amount of expertise, the resettlement program in Iowa. I think that probably other panel members have spoken very well on the subject.

I would like to address the somewhat larger and broader question—and I will edit my written testimony.

First of all, I want to thank you for this opportunity to address a question that is of great importance to me, and I know thousands of others. The question to which I refer is one that is voiced in many circles and in many different forms. It can be reduced to this:

Are the Lao now fleeing Laos political refugees?

Many people answer without benefit of an historical perspective or an understanding of the situation existing in Laos today. I have personally escorted important and politically powerful people around Lao refugee camps in Thailand and have witnessed the sometimes superficial line of questioning pursued in their attempts to grasp the realities of this question.

Because of Lao culture and character and camp rumor on U.S. refugee processing procedures, it is extremely difficult to elicit any concise, nitty gritty information from the average refugee. Those who are politically aware and could possibly offer some insights into life in Laos today often are hesitant to do so, for fear of being thought an ex-supporter or member of the present Lao Government and, therefore, possible excludable from the United States under section 212(a)(28) of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Act.

I believe that my background of 8 years living and working in rural Laos with the U.S. Agency for International Development, and 2 years in Thailand processing refugees bound for the United States, give me some insights on the nonpolitical versus the political refugee question.

That I am biased in favor of the Lao is without doubt, but thus far I have heard and seen in the media only those views that doubt the Lao are political refugees. I wish to take this opportunity to make my views heard.

Laos today is a client state of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. Why this is so is not relevant to this presentation. Since the earliest days of the Indochinese Communist Party, Ho Chi Minh and his followers saw Laos as being within their sphere of influence. Villagers in extreme northwest Laos, an area hundreds of miles from Vietnam, tell of seeing Viet Minh troops in their area as early as 1952, and Vietnamese presence in Laos has been constant since the mid 1940's.

The present government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic is heavily influenced by—some would say run by—the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. Virtually every government ministry has Vietnamese advisers. Foreign and domestic policy is so closely entwined with that of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam that they are all but indistinguishable. Because of the resettlement of Vietnamese civilians in northeast and southeast Laos, it appears that the Lao People's Democratic Republic has perhaps ceded part of its territory to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

A large and increasing number of Vietnamese troops are permanently stationed in Laos. Areas that even at the height of the Indochinese war were without units of Vietnamese, are now forced to garrison these troops.

The Socialist Republic of Vietnam is attempting to reorder traditional Lao society. They are imposing alien concepts on the Lao through the utilization of classic Marxist-Leninist and Maoist practices, many of which ultimately manifest themselves in and adversely affect the economy and quality of life.

There are examples that I could give in many different areas; areas such as education; other areas, such as the arts, religion, agriculture. Other systems—perhaps the Government organization, organization of the population. I will skip over that here today.

I believe the vast majority of the Lao in camps in Thailand are political refugees; but at the same time, I would not deny that there are those who flee simply to join family members, who have left previously.

As for those who say they left because "Life was no fun," or "I was very poor," I hope that by reading my testimony you got some insight into why they felt this way, and what is behind those statements.

I believe that act of fleeing is, in itself, a political statement. Refugees who are caught escaping are many times summarily shot. I have heard other accounts where refugees who have been forcibly repatriated have been executed.

If any of you have the opportunity to be heard in the current Department of State/Department of Justice discussions on section 101(a)(42) of the Immigration and Naturalization Act, dealing with who is and who is not a refugee, I would urge you to consider my testimony here today.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Wayne Johnson follows:]

Prepared Statement of Wayne Johnson

Mr. Chairman and members of the sub-committee, thank you for this opportunity to address a question that is of great importance to me and thousands of others.

The question to which I refer is one that is voiced in many circles and in many different forms but can be reduced to this: "Are the Lao fleeing Laos political refugees?" Many people answer without benefit of a historical perspective or an understanding of the situation existing in Laos today. I have personally escorted important and politically powerful people around Lao refugee camps in Thailand and have witnessed the sometimes superficial line of questioning pursued in their attempts to grasp the realities of this question.

Because of Lao culture and character and camp rumor on U.S. refugee processing procedures, it is extremely difficult to elicit any concise, "nitty-gritty" information from the average refugee. Those who are politically aware and could possibly offer some insights into life in Laos today often are hesitant to do so for fear of being thought an ex-supporter or member of the present Lao government and therefore possibly excludable from the U.S. under Section 212(a) (28) of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Act. I believe that my background of eight years in rural Laos with the U.S. Agency for International Development (1967-1975) and two years in Thailand (1979-1981) processing refugees bound for the U.S. gives me some insight on the non-political vs. political refugee question. That I am biased in favor of the Lao is without doubt but thus far I have heard and seen in the media only those views that doubt the Lao are political refugees. I wish to take this opportunity to make my views heard.

Laos today is a client state of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (SRV); why this is so is not relevant to this presentation. Since the earliest days of the Indochinese Communist Party, Ho Chi Minh and his followers saw Laos as being within their sphere of influence. Villagers in extreme northwest Laos, an area hundreds of miles from Vietnam, tell of seeing Viet Minh troops in their area as early as 1952 and Vietnamese presence in Laos has been constant since the mid 1940's.

The present government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic (LPDR) is heavily influenced by (some would say run by) the SRV. Virtually every government ministry has Vietnamese advisors; foreign and domestic policy is so closely entwined with that of the SRV that they are all but indistinguishable. Because of the resettlement of Vietnamese civilians in northeast and southeast Laos it appears that the LPDR has ceded part of it's territory to the SRV.

A large and increasing number of Vietnamese troops are permanently stationed in Laos; areas that even at the height of the Indochinese war were without units of Vietnamese are now forced to garrison these troops.

The SRV is attempting to reorder traditional Lao society. They are imposing alien concepts on the Lao through the utilization of classic Marxist-Leninist and Maoist practices, many of which ultimately manifest themselves in and adversely affect the economy and quality of life.

Consider the following in assessing the political vs. refugee question:

Education. Many textbooks used in schools are direct translations from Vietnamese texts. Eligibility for higher education depends a great deal on having the proper background, degree of revolutionary fervor and political awareness. Politics and Marx-Leninism are mandatory in secondary schools and even grade school children are taught to count by using lessons that contain political messages. Neither parents nor students can object to this as to do so would be considered an anti-state activity and mark them to join thousands of others in a labor camp, euphemistically called "seminar", in an underdeveloped and isolated part of the country.

Arts. Traditional Lao songs and dances have been given new words and movements and are used as a tool in reordering society and fostering political awareness. Performances of these art forms, previously done either spontaneously or on certain holidays or occassions, are now often rigidly dictated to dovetail with or supplement political meetings; celebration for celebration's sake is now frowned upon as being unproductive and wasteful of resources.

New stamps and money were designed in the SRV by Lao artists under the direct supervision of Vietnamese technicians; both depict scenes of war, revolution, solidarity and political economy.

Religion. Traditional Lao life was centered around the village Buddhist temple and religion has, in the past, permeated every aspect of their culture. Non-Buddhist, non-ethnic Lao traditionally practiced spirit worship that they believed allowed them to live in harmony with their surroundings and protected them from the unknown.

The belief systems of both Buddhists and spirit worshippers have been seriously compromised by the actions of the LPDR. "Buddhist" monks trained in revolutionary politics have been inserted into temples to undermine and twist the teachings of the Lord Buddha; young Lao males, who all have a duty to enter monkhood, are discouraged from doing so by the removal of the support mechanisms that allow them to do so. The "begging" of monks for food (which is actually an act on the monk's part that enables the people making offerings to "gain" merit) is discouraged and monks are made to work for their upkeep - which is a violation of the precepts of the religion.

Those who practice spirit worship have seen their rights curtailed as many of their ceremonies involve the sacrifice of animals or group consumption of large amounts of rice wine. The killing of livestock, even for personal consumption, is frowned upon and, in some instances, forbidden. Cadre attached to provincial and district offices have, in many rural areas, catalogued livestock and poultry to facilitate future collectivization and have warned villagers against the destruction of State property.

Agriculture. Collectivization of agriculture has been tried with the results being uneven. As Laos has an over abundance of land in relation to its population, any collectivization must be seen as an effort to organize and control the rural populace and their produce rather than strictly means to increase production. Although the government has said it is pulling back from collectivization, refugee reports, as recent as February of this year, indicate efforts along these lines are continuing.

Even disregarding collectivization, there is an extremely burdensome system of taxes imposed upon farmers that, coupled with restrictions on the movement and personal vending of crops, result in both underproduction and scarcity of rice (the staple food crop) both in the market and on the farm.

Traditionally, Laos has usually been a rice surplus or, at worst, a subsistence level, country. Short supply in the past has been related more to natural disasters, producers displaced by war and shortcomings in internal distribution; farmers rarely lacked rice for personal consumption.

Current taxing systems have resulted in a scarcity of rice on the farm and, in recent years, a comparatively high price of rice in the open market. The harvest of a farmer's crop is often monitored by cadre from the district or sub-district office. The threshed rice (paddy) is then apportioned to the farmer in relation to the size of his family. The remainder, which is by far the largest portion, is then consigned to a communal village storage facility to be used to feed the military and government officials in the area. In some instances, the entire crop has been put into the communal facility and then rationed back to the producers. This rice that is kept by the State is known by many terms, some of which are no longer in use. Some of these terms are:

1. Rice to help the State
2. Preparedness Rice
3. Rice to strike the agressors
4. Warehouse rice

The net result of all of this is that it is now common for many producers to be short of what traditionally constitutues at least 80% of their diet-rice. As they do not share the benefits of increased production, there is no incentive to produce more. Therefore, those people who are non-producers and who must depend on the marketing system to sustain them also feel the pinch.

Were any of you to visit a refugee camp and ask a refugee why he or she left Laos, you might well be told, "Because I was very poor without enough to eat." Would you have the knowledge or foresight necessary to see what conditions caused the refugee to make that statement?

There are many more activities generaced by Vietnamese mobilization and motivational techniques that are political in nature but manifest themselves in other ways. Let me touch on a few:

Organization of the Population. Traditionally, the Lao have lived in a loosely structured and unregimented society. The Royalist government in the years prior to the change of authority, touched only a small porportion of the people. The LPDR, under the influence of the SRV, have moved to establish greater control over the people.

One of the techniques used is that of the nouei or unit system. Villages or neighborhoods are divided into units of typically five families each. It is the responsibility of each unit leader (houa na nouei) to be aware of what the people in his unit are doing and where they are at any given time. He is also responsible to disseminate certain instructions to those in his unit. Because the authorities in some areas suspect villagers of supporting the rightist anti-government forces operating in Laos, surveilance of the population is deemed to be an important task. To accomplish this, an informer network, called Konglawn, has been set-up; leaders of this network have the authority to order the arrest of suspect individuals.

Other organizational and/or mobilizational bodies are: Young Men's Association, Young Women's Association, Revolutionary Youth, Farmers' Association and Old People's Association. Some of these, seemingly, have no real duties or functions but exist solely to accustom the members to regimentation. Some organizations, such as the "Awakening Group" (Kana Pouk Louk) or the "Stirring-Up Group" (Kana Khon Kouay) are quasi-governmental groups designed to bring about a change in attitude or awareness in the general population.

The imposition of devices to bring about individual or collective feelings of guilt is another important intrusion on the Lao and one that is foreign to their culture. Criticism and self-criticism sessions are held that involve villagers; the vehicles to bring the villagers together for these exercises are very often the above mentioned organizations. The idea is that the villagers, sensitive to peer pressure, should "confess" their shortcomings vis a' vis the government line or policy. It is said that these meetings very rarely have the intended effect even when held in military units, which are a much more homogenous and disciplined group. Whether effective or not, they do create a significant amount of discomfort and apprehension.

In conclusion, let me say that the policies, organizations and techniques that I have described have not uniformly been in effect in Laos in all areas at all times. All of them, however, have been employed at some time and have contributed to the discontent felt by the average Lao. It is only logical that the urban areas, such as they are, would be the last to be

mobilized and there are real benefits in leaving some vestiges of the old society in those areas that are most visible to the small number of visitors allowed into the country.

I believe the vast majority of the Lao in camps in Thailand are political refugees; but at the same time, I would not deny that there are those who flee simply to join family members, who have left previously. As for those who say they left because "... life was no fun ..." or "I was very poor", I hope I have given you an insight into why they felt this way and what is behind those statements. I believe the act of fleeing is in itself a political statement; refugees who are caught escaping are many times summarily shot; I have heard other accounts where refugees who have been forcibly repatriated have been executed. If any of you have the opportunity to be heard in the current Department of State - Department of Justice discussions on section 101(a) (42) of the INA dealing with "who is" and "who is not" a refugee, I would urge you to consider my testimony here today. Thank you.

Senator GRASSLEY. Thank you.

I'd like to address what you said about "Life is no fun," and "I am very poor." You asked us to look into what's behind these statements, in just a very general way, is there any relationship to that economic condition of Southeast Asians and the economic conditions of the Haitians?

You know, there is a feeling that these people are fleeing basically for economic reasons, although there's a Federal judge in Florida that said this isn't the case and I've heard that all you've go to do is read his opinion, and you come to the same conclusion. But are the economic conditions of the Southeast Asians, in this legal sense, different than economic conditions of people in Haiti? Or maybe you don't even know enough about it that you'd care to respond.

Mr. JOHNSON. I could respond in depth to conditions in Laos. Haiti, I'm sorry, I have no background in that.

Senator GRASSLEY. But you don't even have any feel of whether or not it might be the same situation?

Mr. JOHNSON. No, sir, I don't.

Senator GRASSLEY. Do others on the panel?

Sister PATRICIA. I can't answer that.

Senator GRASSLEY. OK. Thank you.

Sister PATRICIA. It's an interesting comparison, but I——

Senator GRASSLEY. A lot of blame has been placed on voluntary agencies for introducing refugees to the welfare system, and then encouraging the continued use of the system. Please respond to that criticism. Is it a valid one? And, if so, what should you, as a

voluntary agency representative, do to correct the situation? Or if it's a Federal policy under Federal law, what should I be doing to correct It?

Ms. HARPSTER. Well, I think that's an easy one for me to answer, as I said, we do not place our refugees on welfare.

Senator GRASSLEY. OK. And you want to stop there?

Ms. HARPSTER. Yes.

Senator GRASSLEY. OK. Sister Pat?

Sister PATRICIA. Our philosophy is to relate to the individual person according to their needs, and to encourage them, as quickly as possible, to become self-sufficient.

Certain of the ethnics are employable right away and, within a short time of being here, have found some kind of a job. A few of the ethnics—and even within the culture there would be certain ethnics, like I'm thinking of particular ones that are educated, of the same ethnic, and then a large group of them not educated, not able to read and write in their own culture.

I might as well just use a family, a family that came with—to illustrate our philosophy, a family came, and there were eight people in the family—husband, wife, and six children. The man was uneducated, could neither read nor write in his own language. He was placed on assistance. We used his basic grant which, at that time, I think it was only $250, because that was in 1977. So with $250, we got him housed and settled and started him on his way.

He waited for a period of probably about 6 months, while we really didn't know what to do with them. We had a close contact with him, because he was totally disoriented culturally, and we feared—in some of the cases, you really have to keep a close connection with them, because the problems of resettlement and of acculturation can be so strong that there are emotional problems. So we worried about this man, because he could neither read nor write, and how was he going to start off in this new culture in America, and all this?

We happened to be able to use the Proteus program for him to get on an ESL and job training. And so he entered that program and completed that program. And now he is working and supporting his family. And they have also had another child in the meantime.

Without that six or eight—I can't remember specifically how long this particular person was on welfare—food stamps, medical assistance, and all that—I don't know how we could have really handled him.

So I think—you know, we can say that self-sufficiency is definitely our goal, but we adjust ourselves to the particular refugee.

And we tried the other way, Senator. We took a whole group of people to work one summer when they first came in, and within a week they were fired. There were five of them, and I personally drove them out to their place of work. And the manager said, "They're wonderful people, Sister, but until they know when I say, 'Pick up this can and take it over there,' or 'Put this—'" you know, they were doing maintenance work. "Take this mop, and sweep this floor." He said, "I had to literally show them." And, you know, he had five persons. He was going around showing each one

what to do and when they'd finished, showing them the next thing. And he said, "They seem very willing to work, but" he said, "we just can't cope with this."

So we also tried to get them in ESL for a 6 or 9 months' program, and then they all got jobs again, in that program. So——

Senator GRASSLEY. Well then maybe you feel the criticism isn't valid, and if you want to say that you don't think it's valid, then that's your prerogative.

Sister PATRICIA. I think—OK. Yeah. I guess I don't think it's valid. And I think a lot of times, particularly here in Des Moines, we get accused of that. I think the difference is, everybody, perhaps other agencies—everybody that gets off the airplane has to find a job immediately, you know. We take a look at the person, and if they don't read or write in their own language, you've got to do something about it, particularly if there's a large family. How in the world is this going to work?

Senator GRASSLEY. It would be pertinent at this point to ask you the following question.

Does the United States Catholic Council resettle refugees with families who are now drawing public assistance?

Sister PATRICIA. OK. Does——

Senator GRASSLEY. And I might suggest to you, the reason for the question is that that's one of the criticisms that has come out before the committee about your agency.

Sister PATRICIA. It has?

Senator GRASSLEY. It must be, to your knowledge, at least.

Sister PATRICIA. Well, no. I'd have to think through all my case load.

We don't—we really don't like to do that at all, and we have refused sponsorship of some refugees because of that.

Senator GRASSLEY. So you don't think—at least from what cases you know about—that that's valid?

Sister PATRICIA. I don't think so. Now, I'm not saying there aren't some cases, you know. But to my knowledge, no, we aren't—no, because we want them to help. They need to be self-sufficient.

Senator GRASSLEY. Well, if you obtain new knowledge of this practice, and want to respond in writing to us, the record will be open and we'll include your response in the record.

Mr. Johnson?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, Senator. I would like to just briefly give you an overview of the Lutheran mode of sponsorship.

Basically, what we do is make sure that the sponsor is a congregation or a group within several congregations. It is my job, once a congregation says they are interested in sponsoring a family, to make sure that this group has sufficient resources to, indeed, undertake the resettlement responsibilities. And I ask hard questions: "How much money do you have in your coffers?" "What are job possibilities?" "Are you going to find housing?"

I will not say that there are not Lutheran-sponsored families on welfare. I'm sure there are. I'm also sure that the percentage is rather small.

We do not resettle large numbers of refugees. Perhaps Iowa, statewide, maybe 10 or 12 percent of the people coming in are done by the Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Services.

We find, conversely, where the system may at some time force people to be on welfare, as was alluded to previously.

Example: A lady, four kids. The sponsor, the church, has everything in hand. The lady is not employable. The sponsors, the church congregation, are supporting them. They want medicaid as a backup. They may not use it, they may use it. But they want it as a backup.

The lady, the family, cannot be on medicaid unles she also accepts aid for dependent children. The congregation refuses to sign her up for this. So there they're caught. They do not have the backup of medicaid, unless they sign up and she receives AFDC payments.

In many instances the system is the culprit.

I do not believe that we, here in Iowa, at least—in fact, I know we don't—encourage refugees to go on welfare. We discourage it.

Ms. HARPSTER. Could I——

Senator GRASSLEY. Go ahead.

Ms. HARPSTER. It seems to me that if that's a concern, and it's one that I think we've all heard a lot, that one way to deal with that is: What these people need, no matter who they are, is English language training and some kind of vocational training and, as Sister Pat said, a time period to absorb as much of that kind of training as they can until they become self-sufficient.

So one of the ways to address that is to have English language classes and vocational training, because it's my experience that 99.9 percent of the people who come to the United States as refugees want to come here to work, and to be self-sufficient—very much.

Senator GRASSLEY. Go ahead, Sister Pat.

Sister PATRICIA. Until a year ago, entry jobs were simple. If the refugee could speak minimal English, we could find them a cleaning job, or a restaurant job, or a dishwasher job.

We have been—I have people call my office every day of the week—refugees—asking me to put them on a list, and if I hear of any jobs, call them. So I take their name down, and I do that. Sometimes people call me at my office and say, "I have such-and-such a job."

But I'm telling you, Senator, there are not enough jobs, you know. And so maybe—what you're saying, too, is that could—you know, here I am, very much into this sponsorship thing. But part of our problems are trying to find them a job at a very low level. And it's difficult right now.

Senator GRASSLEY. And this is one reason why we have very prestigious groups, like the AFL-CIO, testify before our committee about aliens taking jobs from American citizens—maybe they don't testify so much on the refugee problem, but about the illegal immigration problem, as an example. Something has just got to be done. And that's more acute right now, with the economy the way it is, than before.

Sister PATRICIA. Part of the thing is that they just have to stay on welfare, because they can't really find a job. You know, unless you're at the agency, you don't know how they're asking for jobs. And I'm just telling you that, from a refugee's viewpoint, they want work.

Senator GRASSLEY. This next question may not be something you can respond to, and if you can't, just say so.

Again, criticism has been directed at the voluntary agencies and the system in New York, which assigns the refugees to particular agencies. It has been said that this system is a major cause of the problem of impacted areas; that is, the new families are assigned to the same agency that resettled their relatives, and then the new family is sent to that same area; hence, impacted areas.

Is legislation necessary in order to solve this problem?

Ms. HARPSTER. I would be wary of having legislation solve the problem. If that is, indeed, a problem, I would think——

Senator GRASSLEY. You don't sense it as a problem? I mean you could legitimately take issue with the statement, but it is one that we've sensed at the national level.

Ms. HARPSTER. Well, one of the dilemmas from the perspective of an agency is that one of the prime motivations for choosing where a family will live in the United States is family reunification, you know; and particularly for the Southeast Asian families. Family is of tremendous importance to these people.

So it's a double bind that we face. Do we allow a family to come to Des Moines or to Marshalltown, or wherever, because their family is here, even though it may be difficult in a highly impacted area, difficult to find a job; or do we say no, and have them shunted off to another town, where they know no one?

I would be really reluctant to have legislation deal with that. If, indeed, it's a problem I think the agencies can deal with it better.

Sister PATRICIA. I would not be for legislation on that point. In my experience in working with the agency, Senator, it is true that originally if the family came from USCC, they would come to our agency, make out the affidavit of relationship, and the second family would come through us. But since 1979, that changed; so that somebody can come to our agency and make out an affidavit, and they can be assigned to Lutheran Social Services.

It is not true that necessarily the place where the refugee chooses, or the VOLAG that the refugee in the camp ask for is, indeed, the actual agency that brings them.

My understanding is, they have a big table in New York and they pass out cases, and whichever agency lands the case gets the case.

Senator GRASSLEY. It's all by the lot?

Sister PATRICIA. Well, that's how I understand it. Now originally it wasn't, but——

Mr. CUSHING. No, that isn't so.

Sister PATRICIA. That isn't so?

Mr. CUSHING. No.

Sister PATRICIA. All right. How is it done?

Mr. CUSHING. As the cases come in from overseas, say having been initiated by Wayne Johnson, for example, when he worked for Thailand, there may be an indication on that case that the refugee prefers this or that agency, or knows that his relative was resettled by a certain agency, and says he wants to go there.

It goes back into New York to the American Council for Voluntary Agencies, and at that point a check is made against what is now a computer, that earlier was a hand file, and it's determined

from the records there where the original linking family is, and what agency is involved in it.

That is then offered to that same agency. And unless that agency refuses it, for whatever reasons—it can't cope with it, it no longer has a staff in that area, whatever it is—it is not then thrown out into an open, or free case, as it's called. So it is put to the original agency, and it is only by the refusal of that agency that it falls into another agency's hands.

Sister PATRICIA. Would it be that the agency has already reached a certain quota?

Mr. CUSHING. No. We can change the quotas to accommodate family reunification. What we would do is stop a certain agency from getting free cases if, to fulfill its contract, it had still to take linking cases.

Sister PATRICIA. Oh, I see. OK.

Ms. MILDER. Could I ask a question? I've heard something about refugees who come in, or put down on their affidavit that they have a relative in a certain area where there is no such relative, and then they just move to California anyway.

Is that happening?

Mr. CUSHING. Since, in America, one is free to move, we should think very carefully, before we try to restrict the movement of people in the United States. They have been invited to live in the United States. While a refugree may be placed initially in Des Moines, or anyplace else, if he may be tempted to go to California, because the climate is right, the community is nice—and as I said in earlier testimony here—because there was perhaps a too-generous invitational system of public assistance. We or the voluntary agency can't hold him as though he were a ward or a prisoner. These people haven't been invited here as refugees to be prisoners. I think we should think twice before we try to restrict their movements.

Ms. MILDER. Does the Federal Government provide any funds for them to move?

Mr. CUSHING. For secondary migration? No. There are cases in which a refugee who was settled in McCook, Nebr., or someplace, is not getting along well, and some relative of his in Des Moines says, "I can get you a job at the same meat packing plant where I am," or whatever, "and I am sure of this."

The voluntary agency here and the voluntary agency in Nebraska might assist him in moving if there is a job waiting here, and they're having trouble finding the fellow a bottom-level job, any job, in Nebraska. He's going to a job. This happens in American life all the time, that people say to friends and relatives, "Come on, I'll get you a job here. Prospects are better."

People are mobile in this society, and refugees, until they get roots in a particular community, are not going to be very anchored. Jobs are the key things.

Senator GRASSLEY. Sister Pat, did you finish your comment, because I want Mr. Johnson to respond, if he cares to, to this question.

Sister PATRICIA. I'll pass to Mr. Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON. The question of impacting a certain area, or as it's sometimes called, the "meat market," at the ACVA in New York, I

think perhaps at the— There was a magazine or newspaper article 6 or 8 months ago that I think sensationalized the process at ACVA, the distribution of cases around the table. I think that was unfair.

The system goes way back, as Mr. Cushing mentioned, to the camps, as to where a person is going to go. One of the criteria under which a refugee is authorized or is able to come into the United States, category 1, has to do with relatives—fathers, mothers, unmarried siblings. This may be the thing that qualifies a refugee to come to the United States in the first place, because he is a category 1 person; therefore, he is going to be resettled in Des Moines or in Orange County, or wherever that may be.

This is something that there is some degree of control over.

The second part of the problem is what has been mentioned here before, and that's secondary migration. And that's something no one has any control over.

Senator GRASSLEY. I want to thank you for your participation in the panel and, obviously, you folks have been right in the middle of this issue and that's why we came out here, to get testimony of people like you. We appreciate your expert testimony and if there's anything that you want included in the record, we normally leave it open for 7 days.

You are all welcome to contact me personally, as your Senator, and also, because I'll be involved with the writing of this legislation. If you have any ideas, you ought to contact me or Ally.

So thank you very much.

Sister PATRICIA. Thank you, Senator.

Senator GRASSLEY. Our third panel represents a variety of groups.

Mr. Roger Herr has held the position of the chief of the bureau of financial assistance in the Iowa Department of Social Services for the past 2 years. This agency is responsible for the policy and procedures regarding AFDC, food stamps, work incentives in refugee programs.

Mr. Nick Bellizzi is dean of the adult and continuing education branch of the Des Moines Area Community College. Mr. Bellizzi serves as project director for the English as a second language project at the college, a project which serves many Indochinese refugees with English language training.

Mr. Murray Drake is a member of the Polk County Board of Supervisors, and I hope that he will be able to enlighten us regarding the impact which refugees have on local governments.

And finally, Dr. Michael Schutz. Dr. Schutz earned his bachelor's degree in sociology from the University of California at Berkeley and his master's and Ph. D. degrees from Northwestern, in sociology. He has been a college and university professor for the past 9 years, teaching courses in sociology, demography, population studies and statistics, as well as other areas. He has been professionally involved and personally concerned about immigration-related issues for many years.

Dr. Schutz lives in Bettendorf, Iowa, and is serving as a consultant and Iowa State coordinator for FAIR, the Federation for American Immigration Reform.

Mr. Herr, then Mr. Bellizzi, Mr. Drake, and Dr. Schutz please proceed in that order.

STATEMENT OF ROGER HERR, BUREAU OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE, IOWA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Mr. HERR. Senator Grassley, ladies and gentlemen, refugee resettlement funds coming into the State of Iowa are used for, No. 1, services. For example, English language training and services under the title 20 system; No. 2, medical assistance; No. 3, cash assistance and, No. 4, administration.

The category, "cash assistance," commonly referred to as welfare, is the focus of this testimony.

Cash assistance in the Iowa refugee resettlement program includes three categories:

No. 1, assistance in the form of a check to families with children and adults, married or single, without children;

No. 2, assistance in the form of a vendor payment to maintain children in foster homes;

No. 3, assistance in the form of a check to certain individuals who qualify under SSI-related programs, such as residential care.

Most cases, as well as most discussion and criticism, fall into the first category. "Cash assistance" in the remainder of this testimony will be limited to this category.

Basic eligibility requirements and payment levels for cash assistance are those that exist for the ADC program, except that assistance is available to, No. 1, individuals without children and, No. 2, families in which children are not deprived of parental care or support.

Unlike ADC, eligibility for cash assistance in the refugee resettlement program at 100 percent Federal reimbursement is limited to the first 3 years after the refugee arrives in this country. This does not affect families who are eligible for ADC, because the 3-year limitation simply means an administrative change of coding, so the State begins paying its share in these cases. For all other cases, assistance in Iowa stops.

Unlike ADC, the first 60 days after arriving in this country, able-bodied refugees do not have to register for work as an eligibility requirement for cash assistance.

The attachment shows that just as the refugee population in Iowa has grown, utilization of cash assistance has grown.

Approximately 40 percent of refugees currently living in Iowa are covered by cash assistance. But many of these families are in the labor market and receiving reduced assistance.

When the ADC program changes, either by State or Federal law, the cash assistance segment of the refugee resettlement program reflects the changes. For example, when ADC payment levels were increased in July 1979, payments in the refugee resettlement program were increased. When changes required by the Omnibus Reconciliation Act were implemented in the ADC program, effective October 1, 1981, the same changes were implemented in the refugee resettlement program.

Like the ADC program, the refugee resettlement program has a goal of helping people attain or retain capability for maximum self-support.

As administrator of both the ADC program and cash assistance protion of the refugee resettlement program in Iowa, I have asked myself if this goal has been attained. My answer is "Yes, to a degree."

Many ADC families and many refugee familes are now former cash assistance cases. But may families don't reach the former status as soon as the caseworker, the administrator, the Legislature, Congress, or John Q. Public would like. And many familes turn to cash assistance before turning to the labor market.

Questions remain:

Will funding crises continue, putting the State in a position to cancel or redue cash assistance cases upon short notice?

Is the 3-year limitation too long or too short?

Should payment levels in cash assistance in the refugee resettlement program be tied to the ADC program, or should States have more flexibility?

No. 4, which doesn't appear, in my speed and short time to prepare this:

Should assistance be given to employable adults without children on the same basis as families with children, including 18 to 21 year olds attending college?

The attachment shows, on a point-in-time basis, the refugees—an estimate of the refugees living in Iowa, and the persons covered by cash assistance. You'll see that originally, at the beginning of the program in Iowa, 26 percent, growing to 34 and, finally, our current estimate of 40 percent.

[Attachment to testimony follows:]

COMPARISON OF REFUGEES IN IOWA TO NUMBER OF REFUGEES ON CASH ASSISTANCE

	Estimate of total number in Iowa (point in time)	Number of persons covered by cash assistance[1]	Percentage of refugees in Iowa covered by cash assistance
Refugees in Iowa:			
January 1976	2,308	611	26
January 1977	2,501	849	34
January 1978	2,654	248	9
January 1979	3,000	1,026	34
January 1980	4,800	1,733	36
September 1980	6,800	2,146	32
September 1981	7,800	3,134	40

[1] These figures include a relatively small number of foster care cases.

Senator GRASSLEY. Why the 9 percent in January of 1978? Or maybe that's an incorrect figure. But that's a dramatic drop.

Mr. HERR. No, the figure is correct. We went through a period of program shutdown, and that program shutdown affects the percentage.

Senator GRASSLEY. OK. The other thing that came to my mind immediately, is just your personal opinion on an unanswered question: Do you think the States should have more flexibility? That's your question No. 3.

Mr. HERR. Without any question, the State should have flexibility in designing its cash assistance program. Certainly there are two categories: Those people qualified for ADC anyway, and they would have to be maintained at the ADC level. Apart from those ADC-eligible families, the State should have fexibility to design their programs.

Senator GRASSLEY. Thank you, Mr. Herr. Mr. Bellizzi?

Mr. BELLIZZI. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF NICK BELLIZZI, DES MOINES AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE, DES MOINES, IOWA

Mr. BELLIZZI. Thank you for giving me the opportunity. I know I called you last week, and I really wasn't scheduled to be on the panel. One of my concerns was the fact that no one seemed to be addressing the whole question of education, so I thought it was necessary to let you know what's happening currently in Iowa and, more specifically, in our particular college district, which I'm more familiar with, about the English as a second language program.

I represent the adult education division of Des Moines Area Community College, and we have been involved in programing the English as a second language program for refugees ever since the program began, in 1975.

Initially, we were involved—and have been—with some Federal dollars, but the Federal dollars have never really been in excess in terms of what we really needed. In my opinion, we've done an excellent job over the past several years, and worked with many different organizations to try to build together a cooperation and a comprehensive kind of program.

I would be here all day if I were list all the agencies for you, but obviously, the Iowa Refugee Service Center, and job service, mutual assistance associations, and Radio Station WHO, who for the past 5 years have carried a half-hour program to provide information to the Indochinese new Americans, since 1975 represent agencies with whom we work.

I'm not really here to blow the Des Moines Area Community College horn in terms of what we have done for the refugees, because obviously it's been too little. We made a commitment early on that unless probably Des Moines Area Community College got involved to do something in the way of trying to provide English proficiency skilled training, that it probably wouldn't be done. We probably were the best institution to do that sort of thing.

So, with the help of some Federal dollars and the commitment of some of our own finances, we launched a very comprehensive program this year, ending this September, serving around 1,700. Around 3,000 persons in the State have gone through some ESL training.

The real purpose today is to provide testimony in relationship to the need for a long-range plan, not only educational plan but a long-term financial commitment.

We're capable at the college of providing that long-term educational plan. We've been doing this for the past 5 or 6 years. The problem is that we're never really sure of where we are with Fed-

eral dollars from year to year, obviously, and that's even perhaps more the case in our present situation.

But let me give you some specifics of what I'm talking about in terms of the need of a long-range plan.

No. 1, currently we have 113 refugees, adult refugees, who are on the waiting list. It's our best estimate, because of the limited funding that we have, that it will be 3 to 6 months before that 113 people, that are throughout our own college district, will become involved in an intensive program. Now, 3 to 6 months for people that are, in some cases, recent arrivals, and among the other problems that they have in terms of job placement, just plain adjustment, is something that we probably really can't appreciate, because we've never really lived in a country in which that particular language is a barrier for us.

So we really probably don't understand their problems as much as we would like to or perhaps even should.

Right now there are 7,700 refugees—and these statistics were provided me by the Iowa Refugee Service Center as of September 30—living in the State. Of those, 3,900 are adults. In our particular college district, there are about 4,100 refugees, and about 2,100 of these are adults. So the efforts of many other people are reaching many of these refugees. The problem is in getting them in all the programs, because we're limited in facilities and we're also limited in funds.

Even more specific, in terms of the length of time that it really takes to make a person proficient in the English language, is sometimes misconstrued by a lot of people. It's not a simple task to take many of the people that we're even getting now, that are very low in the kind of skill development that they've brought with them from the particular country that they've come from, whether it be Laos or Vietnam and make their language skill proficient in a short period of time.

Our best estimate—and we just did a recent in-depth study this past week of this current 113 that are on the waiting list, plus the people that are currently in our program—in our best judgment, it will take at least 1 year to develop English proficiency to the level that I feel is needed to really find good kinds of jobs or, in fact, go into vocational training at our institution or some other institution. In some cases the length of time is even longer, because the lower the skills, the longer it takes.

Many of these people are in programs from 12 to 24 hours a month. We call those our part-time programs. Our intensive program has been, until September 30, 150 hours long. We call that intensive. We can do an excellent job in developing proficiency skills in that length of time.

As of October 1, because of not knowing where we are with funding, and really continuing the program with our own dollars, we've cut that program back to 50 hours. Based upon that number of hours, it will take people somewhere in the neighborhood of a year, as I said, for people that are attending on about one-half that basis, 2 or 3 years. People of very low level will probably be in the program for 4 or 5 years.

Now that's a long-term program. And without that kind of program you have a whole host of other kinds of problems. You have

dead-end jobs, you have jobs that are probably, in many cases, not much better than the welfare check and, in fact, perhaps people then begin to look toward that system to fund them.

Our job, I think, is to try to work with the different agencies to assist people in becoming self-sufficient. In my best judgment, I think that can only come through a good English-as-a-second-language program, coupled with, for those who desire, some real good technical or vocational skills.

The college is still being successful in placing graduates in jobs. Skilled jobs for skilled people are still there. They're not as plentiful as they once were, but they are still there. These people deserve that kind of opportunity. I don't think we're asking for a long-term funding from the standpoint of trying to provide people unlimited opportunity or highly-expensive programs, but, rather, an equal opportunity for people that, unlike ourselves, who started our lives in America have not had those opportunities.

Without Federal assistance, and elimination, in my opinion, of categorical aid for these programs, I think, we'll remove that kind of opportunity, at least in terms of the intensiveness that I feel that those kinds of people need to really develop the skills that we're really talking about. We're talking about the ability to really communicate effectively. Because without that, all the other things are kind of loosely hung together.

Thanks for asking me here today.

Senator GRASSLEY. Can you stay for questions, too?

Mr. BELLIZZI. Sure.

[The prepared statement of Nick Bellizzi follows:]

Prepared Statement of Nick Bellizzi

SENATOR GRASSLEY, PANEL, AND FRIENDS OF THE REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM. IT IS A PLEASURE AND AN HONOR TO COME BEFORE YOU WITH TESTIMONY THIS AFTERNOON TO SPEAK ABOUT THE ADULT REFUGEE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM WHICH WE REFER TO AS ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE.

DES MOINES AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE HAS BEEN INVOLVED IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE, GENERALLY REFERRED TO AS ESL, TO THE ADULT INDO-CHINA REFUGEES SINCE THE REFUGEES BEGAN SETTLING IN THE COLLEGE DISTRICT AS EARLY AS 1975. A COMBINATION OF NEEDED FEDERAL FUNDS AND LIMITED COLLEGE FUNDS HAS ENABLED THE COLLEGE TO BECOME RESPONSIVE TO THE LANGUAGE NEEDS OF THESE NEW AMERICANS. WE SERVED MORE THAN 1,700 ADULT REFUGEES THIS CURRENT YEAR.

THE INITIAL PROJECT VENTURE UTILIZING FEDERAL FUNDS NOT ONLY INVOLVED TEACHING ESL, BUT ALSO CAREER EDUCATION, OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION DISSEMINATION, CAREER EXPLORATION ACTIVITIES, SHORT-TERM PREPARATORY PROGRAMMING, CONSUMER EDUCATION, AND A VARIETY OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES. EARLY ON, THE COLLEGE MADE A COMMITMENT TO BECOME INVOLVED IN THE EDUCATION OF REFUGEES, NOT ONLY BECAUSE OF FEDRAL FUNDS, (WHICH WERE AND ARE STILL DESPARATELY NEEDED), BUT PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF A PHILOSOPHICAL AND MORAL RESPONSIBILITY. WE WANTED TO PLAY A PART IN ASSISTING PEOPLE TO BECOME SELF-SUFFICIENT AND CONTRIBUTORS TO AMERICAN SOCIETY.

THE COLLEGE, THROUGH ITS ADULT EDUCATION DIVISION, HAS ALWAYS HAD AS ONE OF ITS MAJOR OBJECTIVES, THE COMMITMENT TO PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES TO ALL ADULTS WHO DESIRE TO UPGRADE THEMSELVES THROUGH EDUCATION. A LOCAL FINANCIAL COMMITMENT HAS BEEN NECESSARY, BECAUSE FEDERAL FUNDING HAS NEVER BEEN SUFFICIENT TO MEET ALL THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF THE REFUGEES.

THE COLLEGE HAS WORKED COOPERATIVELY IN THIS VENTURE WITH MANY DIFFERENT ORGANIZATIONS AND AGENCIES. THE LIST IS TOO LONG TO INCLUDE THEM ALL, BUT TO GIVE YOU SOME OF IDEA OF THE TYPES OF AGENCIES WE HAVE DEALT WITH, I WILL NAME BUT A FEW: THE IOWA REFUGEE SERVICE CENTER, JOB SERVICE, RADIO STATION WHO, MUTUAL ASSISTANCE ASSOCIATIONS, AND A VARIETY OF SCHOOLS, CHURCHES AND SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS. THESE SERVICE ORIENTED ORGANIZATIONS HAVE PROVIDED FACILITIES, REFERRALS TO THE ESL PROGRAM, INFORMATION, IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS, HOME TUTORING, AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES IN COUNSELING, TRANSPORTATION, CHILD CARE AND JOB PLACEMENT. THEY HAVE ALSO ASSISTED DMACC IN JOINT PROGRAMS FOR ADULTS AND CHILDREN, TEACHER TRAINING AND AN INDOCHINESE RADIO PROGRAM ON WHO RADIO. THIS COOPERATIVE LINKAGE HAS ASSISTED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A WELL-COORDINATED, COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM FOR OUR INDO-CHINESE FRIENDS.

THE VOLUNTEER TUTORING EFFORT HAS BEEN A VALUABLE SUPPLEMENT TO ESL CLASSES AND THIS COOPERATIVE LINKAGE HAS ASSISTED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THESE SERVICES. HOWEVER, VOLUNTEER TUTORING CAN NOT BE CONSIDERED AN ADEQUATE SUBSTITUTE FOR ORGANIZED CLASSES AND INTENSIVE ESL TRAINING WITH TRAINED INSTRUCTORS. ALL OF THE REFUGEES RECEIVING TUTORING ARE RECEIVING AN AVERAGE OF 7 HOURS OF INSTRUCTION PER MONTH. REFUGEES IN ORGANIZED CLASSES RECEIVE 12-24 HOURS/MONTH IN PART TIME CLASSES AND 50 HOURS/MONTH IN FULL TIME CLASSES.

DURING THE LAST SIX YEARS OF PROGRAMMING, THE ESL PROGRAM CONDUCTED BY THE COLLEGE HAS UTILIZED BOTH FEDERAL FUNDS AND COLLEGE FUNDS TO REACH HUNDREDS OF ADULT REFUGEES WHO DESIRE AND NEED A PROFICIENCY IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

INDO-CHINESE, BY NATURE, ARE RESPONSIVE TO EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND DESIRE TO IMPROVE THEIR COMMUNICATION SKILLS. THEY UNDERSTAND THE IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING THESE SKILLS IF TOTAL SUCCESS AND SELF-SUFFICIENCY IS TO BE ATTAINED, AND MAINTAINED. THESE PEOPLE WANT TO CONTRIBUTE TO SOCIETY AND PREFER NOT TO LIVE ON WELFARE, AND WE FEEL THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS AN ECONOMIC STAKE IN ASSISTING IN THEIR GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT.

DMACC HAS DEMONSTRATED ITS COMMITMENT TO THE EDUCATION OF INDO-CHINESE REFUGEES. WE HAVE USED OUR LIMITED RESOURCES EFFICIENTLY, AND THE RESPONSE TO OUR PROGRAMS IS EVIDENCE THAT WE ARE SUCCESSFULLY MEETING THE NEEDS OF THOSE WE HAVE BEEN ABLE TO SERVE.

BUT THE JOB IS NOT DONE, NOR HAVE WE BEEN ABLE TO PROVIDE ESL SERVICE TO ALL WHO WANT AND NEED IT.

DMACC HAS RECEIVED NATIONAL RECOGNITIONN FOR THE QUALITY AND INNOVATIVENESS OF ITS EDUCATIONAL SERVICES TO INDO-CHINESE REFUGEES.

BASED ON OUR EXPERIENCE, WE HAVE BECOME INCREASINGLY AWARE OF THE COMPLEX AND OVERWHELMING EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF INDO-CHINESE REFUGEES AND THE NEED FOR LONG RANGE COMMITMENT AND PLANNING WITH ADEQUATE FINANCIAL SUPPORT.

TO BE MORE SPECIFIC, CURRENT AND FUTURE REFUGEES WILL REQUIRE ESL TRAINING FOR YEARS TO COME. ACCORDING TO THE IOWA REFUGEE SERVICE CENTER AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1981, 7770 INDO-CHINESE REFUGEES RESIDE IN IOWA AT THE PRESENT TIME. APPROXIMATELY 3900 OF THESE ARE ADULTS. WITHIN DES MOINES AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT, 4100 PERSONS ARE CURRENTLY RESIDING AND APPROXIMATELY 2100 OF THESE ARE ADULTS.

THE SERVICE CENTER ALSO TELLS US THAT NEW REFUGEES ARE ARRIVING AT A RATE OF 92 PERSONS PER MONTH, AND THAT APPROXIMATELY 51% OR 47 OF THESE ARE ADULTS IN NEED OF ESL TRAINING.

7700 REFUGEES LIVING IN THE STATE, ALL WITH VARYING DEGREES OF ENGLISH SKILLS AND ALL IN NEED OF COMPREHENSIVE AND INTENSIVE ESL TRAINING. A LONG-RANGE EDUCATIONAL PLAN IS NEEDED, BUT SO IS THE COMMITMENT OF LONG-RANGE FUNDING ASSISTANCE FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. ELIMINATION OF CATEGORICAL FUNDING FOR ESL TRAINING WOULD SERIOUSLY LIMIT OR REMOVE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR THESE NEW AMERICANS TO REACH ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE. THE NEEDS OF THESE PEOPLE ARE MULTI-DIMENSIONAL, BUT LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY IS AT THE CORE OF ADEQUATE LONG-TERM ASSIMILATION. NO ONE MODEL OF EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CAN ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF INDO-CHINESES ADULTS. CENTRAL TO ALL PROGRAMMING EFFORTS IS THE ATTEMPT TO PROVIDE THE MAXIMUM OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE IN RELATION TO THE STUDENT'S ABILITY AND AVAILABILITY. PREPARATORY AS WELL AS INTENSIVE PROGRAMS ARE NEEDED ALONG WITH ELEMENTARY SURVIVAL ENGLISH SKILLS.

CURRENTLY, IN DES MOINES, WE HAVE OVER 113 REFUGEES ON A WAITING LIST FOR ESL TRAINING. WITH NEW ADULTS ARRIVING EACH MONTH AND WITH THE MAJORITY SETTLING IN OUR COLLEGE DISTRICT, IT WILL TAKE AS LONG AS THREE TO SIX MONTHS OR MORE TO GET INTO A PROGRAM.

LIKE ALL AMERICANS, THE DESIRE TO PROVIDE ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR ONE'S OWN FAMILY PERMEATES THE DAILY LIVES OF THESE HIGHLY MOTIVATED STUDENTS.

VERY FEW, IF ANY OF US, HAVE FOUND OURSELVES IN A SITUATION WHICH REQUIRED US TO LEARN A NEW LANGUAGE BECAUSE WE WERE NOW RESIDING IN A NEW COUNTRY. THAT IN ITSELF IS DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND. COUPLE THIS WITH THE NEED FOR A GOOD JOB AND THE ADJUSTMENT PROBLEMS THAT ANYONE HAS IN A MOVE, AND ONE BEGINS TO REALIZE A VERY FRIGHTENING EXPERIENCE. IN FACT, TO ATTEMPT TO DO THESE THINGS WHEN YOU MAY IN FACT BE ILLITERATE IN YOUR OWN LANGUAGE ONLY FURTHER COMPOUNDS THE PROBLEMS--PROBLEMS THAT WE WOULD HESITATE TO TACKLE. BUT MANY REFUGEES ARE EXACTLY IN THIS POSITION. BASED UPON CURRENT ENROLLMENT FIGURES AT PRESENT, IN ORDER TO GIVE YOU A BETTER IDEA OF THE NEED FOR LONG-RANGE PLANNING AND FINANCING, WE HAVE MADE A FAIRLY INDEPTH STUDY OF THE CURRENT REFUGEES IN OUR PRESENT PROGRAM IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE TIME FRAME THAT IS REQUIRED FOR THEM TO DEVELOP SUFFICIENT LANGUAGE SKILLS TO GAIN SELF-SUFFICIENCY.

A TOTAL OF 370 REFUGEES ARE EITHER CURRENTLY ENROLLED OR WAITING TO ENROLL IN OUR INTENSIVE PROGRAM. OVER 1/2 OF THESE PERSONS WILL REQUIRE AT LEAST 1 FULL YEAR TO BECOME PROFICIENT IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. THE REASONING IS BASED ON THE FACT THAT A HEAVY CONCENTRATION OF THIS GROUP HAVE VERY LOW SKILLS AT PRESENT. ANOTHER 462 WHO ARE ENROLLED ON A PART TIME BASIS WILL NOT BE PROFICIENT IN A ONE YEAR PERIOD. IT WILL TAKE A MUCH LONGER PERIOD SIMPLY BECAUSE THE PROGRAM IS LESS INTENSIVE. THEREFORE, IT CAN BE ASSUMED AND OUR EXPERIENCE SUPPORTS THE ASSUMPTION THAT A VERY INTENSIVE PROGRAM IS NEEDED TO MOVE REFUGEES TO PROFICIENCY IN LESS THAN ONE YEAR. OBVIOUSLY THEN, THIS TYPE OF PROGRAM REQUIRES CONTINUOUS FUNDING IF ANY SORT OF PROFICIENCY IS TO EVER BE OBTAINED. THESE ENGLISH SKILLS ARE NEEDED IF REFUGEES ARE TO COMPETE IN THE WORLD OF WORK WITH OTHER PERSONS.

JUST "HAVING A JOB" DOES NOT GUARANTEE FREEDOM FROM LAY-OFFS, JOB ADVANCEMENT, OR ACCESSIBILITY TO UPGRADE OPPORTUNITIES IN THE WORLD OF WORK. THE AMERICAN DREAM OF BEING ABLE TO UPGRADE ONESELF THROUGH HARD WORK AND EDUCATION EXISTS JUST AS STRONGLY IN THE REFUGEE POPULATION AS ANY OTHER SEGMENT OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY.

IN THE PAST, THE GOVERNMENT HAS SUPPORTED THIS DREAM FOR THOSE WITH LIMITED ACCESS TO EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY AND WHO WERE IN FINANCIAL NEED. CIVIL RIGHTS, EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY LAWS, AFFIRMATIVE ACTION GUIDELINES, AND THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973 ALL SPEAK TO THIS ISSUE. REFUGEES ARE NOT ASKING SPECIAL TREATMENT, JUST EQUAL OPPORTUNITY. LIMITED LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY IS THE EQUIVALENT OF BEING HANDICAPPED IN TODAY'S MARKET.

WE DO NOT PROPOSE UNLIMITED OPPORTUNITY OR HIGHLY EXPENSIVE PROGRAMS, ONLY THE OPPORTUNITY FOR A UNIQUE GROUP TO COMPETE ON EQUAL TERMS WITH THOSE FORTUNATE ENOUGH TO HAVE STARTED THEIR LIVES IN AMERICA. THESE ADULTS, ARE STARTING A NEW LIFE AND NEED SUPPORT TO SUSTAIN THEIR HOPE AND DREAMS FOR THEIR FAMILIES. CONTINUED FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE CAN AND WILL PROVIDE THIS OPPORTUNITY ALONG WITH THE MANY PERSONAL COMMITMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN DEMONSTRATED BY THESE REFUGEES OVER THE LAST SEVERAL YEARS.

SUBMITTED BY,

Nick Bellizzi

NICK BELLIZZI, DEAN
ADULT & CONTINUING EDUCAITON
DES MOINES AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

90-377 O—82——6

Enrollment & Statistics
DMACC
English as a Second Language Students
10-1-81

Intensive Program
(12 1/2 Hrs./Week)

Level	Enrolled	Instruction Needed To Gain Proficiency +
Pre-Literate I	30	5 yrs. +
Pre-Literate II	29	3 yrs. +
I	47	1 yr. 3 mo. to 1 yr. 9 mo.
II	57	1 yr. to 1 yr. 6 mo.
III	42	9 mo. to 1 yr.
IV	38	6 mo. to 9 mo.
V	14	3 mo. to 6 mo.
Total	257	

Pre-literate students progress into literate Level II upon completion of pre-literate training. They will probably not progress through all levels but can be taught given enough time and effect.

Waiting To Enter
Intensive Program
(12 1/2 Hrs./Week)

Level	# Waiting	Estimated Time Needed To Gain Proficiency +
Pre-Literate	15	3 yrs. + - 5 yrs. +
I	68	1 hr. 6 mo. - 2 yrs. 3 mo.
II	33	1 yr. 3 mo. - 2 yrs. 6 mo.
III	3	1 yr. - 1 yr. 3 mo.
Total	113	

Part-Time Programs
(4 Hrs./Week)

Level	Enrolled	Instruction Needed To Gain Proficiency +
Pre-Literate I	64	*
Pre-Literate II	57	*
I	183	4-6 years
II	58	3-4 years
III	32	2-3 years
IV	41	1-2 years
V	27	1-1 yr. 6 mo.
Total	462	

* Probably will never be proficient enough to reach economic independence.

+ Proficiency is calculated as completion of Level V. The skill level attained would allow a student to function in a traditional Adult Basic Education class.

Senator GRASSLEY. Murray, how long have you been a member of the Polk County Board of Supervisors? I know it's been a long time.

Mr. DRAKE. Three years. I was mayor of West Des Moines 9 years, and 3 years on the board of supervisors.

STATEMENT OF MURRAY DRAKE, MEMBER, POLK COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Mr. DRAKE. I did turn in a written statement. I apologize for being late, but I've only been involved in this program for about 2 weeks, and I was notified about 2 weeks ago that I'd be serving on a board for the National Association of Counties in reference to immigration problems, and probably less than 2 weeks ago, that I'd be serving on this board. And I just then served on that committee in Washington this last Tuesday, and I wanted to wait until after I came back from that to really be ready for this. And it has been a very educational process.

Senator GRASSLEY. And you ought to continue to have dialog with us from that standpoint during the next few months as we go into our——

Mr. DRAKE. We'll be having a meeting—another meeting, probably in December or January, in either Washington or——

Senator GRASSLEY. Why don't you just make it a point of stopping by my office and/or Ally's office in the Russell Building. If you can't see me, at least see her, to keep us up to date.

Mr. DRAKE. I'd be happy to.

I want to start in with this written statement, the third paragraph, and then make some comments afterward.

The large number of refugees admitted into the United States since 1975 has proven the need for a better working relationship between those on the Federal level who work in the immigration program and we on the local level in county government who are responsible for the welfare of these people once they are placed into our communities.

By all means it is important that local governments are informed in advance of any program the immigration department may have of settling any number of new refugees in their area. Such action has direct effect first on our budget process. Even if State or Federal Government has a method to reimburse for cost, we still must budget to cover these costs in advance.

Local governments start their budgeting 6 months prior to the beginning of a budget year, so we must be aware of problems that need to be funded well in advance, as much as 1 year lead time.

As we all know, State and Federal Government fund their needs through a means of revenue; we in local government in most instances must use property tax as our means of funding cost of local government.

Over the years we have been forced to continue to increase the cost of local government and the burden of paying this cost by the property owner has reached a serious concern from our citizens. Local government, because of the cutback in Federal assistance to local government, now find that they also must cut back on spending and reduce services.

You who are responsible for the refugee program and immigration must realize that we on the local level cannot take any extra budget burdens in the future unless the Federal Government agrees to fund the programs. In immigration, this would include expenses in social services, medical, et cetera.

The need for communication in the future is most important, because records show the largest percentage of Indonesian refugees entered our country since 1975; and most important, in 1978, the burden of care was placed on 40 counties in the total Nation. This proved to be a very poor process on the part of the Federal Government and a great burden on a few.

It has to be important that the economy of any area that settlers enter must be considered to assure that refugees have an opportunity for jobs and survival, and that, by the same token, jobs are not being taken from our own local citizens.

Polk County is one of the 40 counties I mentioned, and this county has been shouldered with the additional burden—at a time—when we have a very definite decrease in jobs and the economy is at a very low ebb.

Our Indochinese refugees have been settled in the area long enough now that they will soon no longer have Federal aid, and will be on our social service rolls, because there are just not jobs to support them, as well as our own citizens.

There is even need for the Federal Government to extend the term of assistance for these newcomers until the economy on the local level can carry the additional cost and serve the needs of these people.

Polk County now has 1,124 cases pending for aid to our Indochinese refugees.

We, in county government throughout this Nation feel that there are practical limits to the number of immigrants and refugees who can successfully be absorbed into this country.

That Congress consider extending the period of Federal reimbursement of State and local costs of assisting refugees beyond 30 months;

That Congress consider the establishment of a Federal program of impact aid to minimize the financial impact of refugees on local services; and

That State and local government be involved in planning for the initial resettlement of refugees.

I've had an opportunity, Senator, in sitting and listening to the testimony here and reviewing back on what has taken place in a meeting I attended in Washington, and some of the involvement we've had in Polk County—which has been minor up to this point, but we do expect it to increase—that the funding that the Federal Government provides on a 36-month period is funds to give that refugee an opportunity to become established in the area that they're located. And those refugees, wherever they may come from, whatever nation, are human beings. Some have the ability to be able to adjust very quickly. Others do not have that ability. So we do expect some, probably—and more likely will end up on our relief rolls in our counties.

And as I think about it, I feel that possibly the need to extend the 36 months may only be needed for those who have had difficul-

ty in becoming established in the community and cannot find ways of financing their livelihood; that possibly the Federal Government should extend, for those people, additional financial aid for—at this time I would say possibly 12 months.

Then, if possible, at the time that aid is extended to them, that the county should be notified of the problems that may exist, so it does give us an opportunity to, in advance, prepare budgets of what we feel may be coming up within a year's time in reference to newcomers who are coming into our community.

We have warm feelings for the refugees from the foreign countries. We know that the country is a country that has become great when built on the immigration. We want those people to come into our country and be successful, to be able to be established, have homes and raise families and be successful as any other citizen in our country. But you have to realize, when the process of that immigrant coming to the country reaches a point where they fall on our relief rolls and it becomes a burden not only to them, but also to us in local governments, that we do need the assistance to help aid them to be able to continue to where they possibly can get back on their feet and get back into the role of a local citizen and be gainfully employed and self-sustaining.

Senator GRASSLEY. Thank you, Murray. In your remarks, you answered a question I was going to ask about the 36-month period of time, and the problem it creates for State government.

Mr. DRAKE. I mentioned that, Senator, because the atmosphere of the meeting I was in in Washington, was that that time should be extended. But as I sit here and listen to testimony, and review what was gone through, in order to make more money available to take care of more people, again I say those who have been able to establish themselves within 36 months probably would not have that need of additional assistance.

Senator GRASSLEY. Well, let me follow up with this question.

What steps are being taken by local governments to insure that refugees will be self-sufficient at the end of this time? Is there anything that they are doing or, in your judgment, should do? Or if you want to take issue with the premise of the question, that's all right too.

Mr. DRAKE. I would say, directly with the board, we probably haven't been given that direct responsibility. I think those who are involved in education in the community, those who have taken care of the placement—religious organizations I think have done an excellent job, have been responsible for the settlement of people in the area.

My one concern is, as our responsibility on the local level, is the fact that we've had cutbacks in the CETA program, and I can very plainly see the need for the CETA program, probably, to assist those who have had problems after that 36-month period, that may need additional help. Or those who have been successful through the 36-month period that then may be put in a position where they have to change to jobs and they need retraining assistance. And that's one of the programs that's been cut back on Federal assistance.

We'd certainly like those who are responsible or who can provide additional funding for the CETA program to give it serious consid-

eration, if nothing else, just for that prime purpose. I happen to feel it's very important.

Senator GRASSLEY. Thank you. Dr. Schutz?

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL K. SCHUTZ, PH. D., IOWA STATE COORDINATOR FOR THE FEDERATION FOR AMERICAN IMMIGRATION REFORM

Dr. SCHUTZ. Thank you, Senator.

I am very happy to have this opportunity to speak to you today. The title of my prepared remarks, as you know, is "A Time for Limits."

It's possible that I'm taking a position which has not yet been heard from other witnesses today. But I know my remarks are not totally out of sync with the thinking of many other people. I submit that the Gallup poll, the Roper poll and other national data indicate that my feelings are, in fact, the feelings of the majority of the American population.[1]

Before I start—and I will try to make it very brief—I want to make several introductory points.

IOWA REFUGEE SERVICE CENTER

First of all, I have nothing but praise and admiration for Colleen Shearer and the staff of the Iowa refugee service center. I think they've done an extraordinary job, with the job they've had to do. I am very impressed by their dedication, their skill and so forth; and I'm even more impressed by the concept of their program. I think it is extremely well thought out, well implemented, and well executed.

So I'm in no way opposing their program. I think it's excellent.

I think it's extremely important that our program in Iowa, especially that of Colleen Shearer's group, has been jobs oriented, rather than welfare oriented. Far too often, in relation to the question, Who should be in charge of refugee resettlement? The answer is, the institutions and agencies dealing with minorities and poor.

Our answer, that the people who should be in charge of refugee resettlement are the Iowa Department of Job Service, I think is an excellent choice, and one that is virtually unique in the United States and deserves an immense amount of our approval.

It is also very important that sponsors have got to be accountable for every single refugee, and that one of the primary responsibilities of the sponsor is to find the refugee a job. That is criterion No. 6, for being considered a good sponsor and it is underlined—or in boldface—in the publications by the refugee service center. I think this is excellent. The orientation is definitely there, to try and put refugees on the road toward cash employment, rather than cash assistance. That is absolutely essential, for their own self-respect and for harmonious relations relative to the other citizens in the State.

---

[1] For example, the Roper poll of 1980 showed that 80 percent of the American people think that legal immigration should be reduced overall. The majority of the American people clearly feel that in this area of refugee admissions and immigration in general, now is a time for limits.

But the trouble is, if we start to look at the realities of the situation we must ask, All right, notwithstanding all these well-administered programs—what's the bottom line? We have seen, in Colleen Shearer's own expression, the development of a swing toward welfare by the refugees. That's her expression, not mine, "the swing toward welfare."

If I may quote briefly, in speaking before the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy, in Denver, on February 25, 1980, Colleen Shearer said: "Nearly 5 years into the resettlement program, the realities are * * * that a large percentage of the refugees are being brought into the United States without individual sponsors being assigned to them * * * that unsponsored refugees are truly left helpless among us and many times have no choice but welfare * * * the percentage of refugees utilizing cash assistance is increasingly * * *" and, perhaps most alarmingly, "refugees are quitting jobs they have held for months and years in order to avail themselves of public assistance."

That's Colleen Shearer speaking, herself.

One question that, of course, we want to deal with relative to the State of Iowa is this: we have maintained that we are doing things differently here in Iowa; we have maintained that in the rest of the country agencies have pushed people toward welfare rather than toward jobs.

Hopefully, our bottom line—our statistics, would indicate different results. And I think for years the different results have been there.

Now, the statistics are kind of hard to deal with. For one thing, the Iowa Refugee Service Center has ony resettled about half the refugees in the State of Iowa. We have to bear that in mind when looking at any figures. The indication has been that refugees resettled by the Iowa Refugee Service Center have had a far lower use rate of public assistance money than Iowa refugees resettled by other VOLAGS. That appears to be statistically demonstrable.

But the question is: All right, that's historically true; but does that remain true today, in 1981? And again we say this is hard to see, because the swing toward welfare is increasing.

And if you don't mind, Senator, I'd like to quote briefly from a publication of the Iowa Refugee Service Center, called, "The Iowa Orienting Express," May 1981—not even a regular edition, sir; a special edition, put out specifically to get across a certain message. This edition consists of one article, printed in four languages—the same article. And the article is entitled, "Special Message to Southeast Asians in Iowa Who Are Receiving Public Assistance." It's one article, in four languages, and I'd just like to read a few sentences to you, to kind of get the flavor of it: "The State of Iowa has run out of cash assistance money for refugee assistance because so many refugees have applied to get cash assistance * * *" and a couple other sentences, to kind of make the point: "There are many people who can work but who do not work because they would rather have the welfare check * * *. If all refugees who could work would go to work, there would be enough money to help those who cannot work."

That's straight out of the Iowa Orienting Express.

Senator GRASSLEY. Well, you can't find fault with that message, though.

Dr. SCHUTZ. No. It's a true fact. I'm not disagreeing with their statements.

Senator GRASSLEY. Well, no, what I mean is it's trying to instill in the refugees a good principle.

Dr. SCHUTZ. That's right. Oh, absolutely. The principle that they should seek jobs rather than welfare.

Senator GRASSLEY. Yes.

Dr. SCHUTZ. Absolutely. No argument at all.

But what they're saying in, in spite of the good intentions, right here in Iowa welfare use is increasing. And they're trying to convince refugees to not do this, for the sake of their own self-respect, the sake of the community, et cetera.

REFUGEES AND JOBS

But the real irony here—and this is, in a sense, what is really tragic—is that Colleen Shearer and people say this swing toward welfare didn't have to happen. They say that it happened because the other VOLAGS have been pushing people toward welfare instead of toward jobs. They say that if everybody was doing what we are doing, this swing toward welfare wouldn't have to happen.

But, I submit, sir, that unfortunately, that's just not the case.

Because the irony of this entire situation is the job market in America today. That is ultimately the bottom line. And what we really have here—and I'm summarizing as briefly as I can—what we have here is two sides of the same coin—same coin, two sides. On the one side we can say, "Welfare money is limited. The Federal Government is not supplying enough. The cities are in trouble. The cities don't have money. The Federal Government says, 'Well, we don't have money.' The welfare money is running out."

The other side of the same coin: "Jobs are running out, too."

You take them off welfare, and send them to find jobs. But there aren't enough jobs. So they go to welfare, and we complain because they're on welfare.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN AMERICA AND IOWA

The unemployment situation in America is the worst that it has been in years, because of the general economy of the country, and where this Nation is headed with all kinds of economic problems.

I'd just like to mention a few statisitics, sir, if you don't mind.

The nationwide rate for unemployment, OK?

In 1978 and 1979, 6 and 5.8 percent, respectively—which is pretty bad already.

But the figure for 1980, 7.1 percent.

And the projected average unemployment rate for 1981 is 7.4 percent.[1] That is extremely high, and one of the highest rates we've had in years. And those figures come straight from Washington, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

In the State of Iowa, how does all this affect us?

---

[1] Furthermore, the current rate is increasing, and it may even reach 8 percent.

Traditionally, the unemployment rate for Iowans has been considerably below the national level—no question. The rates for 1978 and 1979 were 4 percent and 4.1 percent for the State of Iowa—well below the national average.

Well, we're still below the national average, but the trend is there. The rate for 1980, 5.7 percent. The projected rate for 1981, right now, 6.2 percent.

That roughly translates out to well over 90,000 Iowans in the labor force who are not currently able to find jobs.

So the refugees are in a double bind: Cash assistance is running out and so is the number of jobs. And the problem seems to be not the fault of the Iowa Refugee Service Center—certainly not the fault of Colleen Shearer and her group; their work is tremendous. But the job market is simply getting overloaded.

And I would submit that, given the current economic realities, maybe we should not be admitting very many more refugees, if any.

REFUGEE ADMISSIONS: NO END IN SIGHT?

You've got to look at the history. When the Asian refugee program began with the fall of Saigon in 1975, and people were asking for money for refugee resettlement the basic question in Washington and around the country was: "Well, how many people are we talking about? Every single Vietnamese?" Of corse not. The idea was to help those people who had particular reason to say, "If we stay, we're going to get shot. We worked for the CIA; we worked for the U.S. State Department in Saigon—whatever; our names are known to the Vietcong; we're going to get shot if we don't leave; we worked for you; we've risked our lives; you kind of owe us something."

Fair enough.

It was estimated that about 100,000 or 130,000 Asians would be included in the resettlement refugee program. That seemed reasonable, and certainly humane, and in fact, I think, very necessary.

But look how it's grown.

There has been crisis after crisis in Southeast Asia; one crisis after another.

As of the end of August 1981, over 528,000 Southeast Asians have come into the United States. And as we heard in testimony earlier this morning, last month, September 1981, over 20,000 more came into the United States.

I have been on the phone to the State Department, talking to the refugee resettlement people, and there's no indication that the figures are going to drop dramatically. The 20,000 figure is unusually high for a 1-month period. Granted, but next year they're looking at over 130,000 more people coming in. There's no end in sight.

As for the State of Iowa, OK, we have seen a slight reduction in the flow of refugees—Asian refugees into the State of Iowa. The figures that I have show that in 1980 the average was around 125-140 per month. It varied per month, of course. The last 6 months, the average has been under 100; say around 92, is one figure I get from Marv Weidner, out at the Iowa Refugee Service Center. So we've had a decrease of, say, 35 percent.

Still, indications are that refugees continue to enter Iowa at least 65 percent, or about two-thirds, of the previous rate. And I submit that this simply cannot go on forever. It just can't.

I submit that Asian refugee admissions into America and into Iowa should be greatly reduced at once. We can look at the whole immigration situation, which includes illegal immigration and so forth and so on. The whole thing is huge. And this is just one part of immigration, that appears to be getting out of control in this country. We are admitting people by the tens of thousands, with no end in sight, and no real leveling-off in sight.

I have asked people at the refugee center, laughingly, "Do you see yourself going out of business one of these days?" and they said, "Oh, yeah, we thought we were going to go out of business several times, but it keeps on going."

Where is the end? Perhaps there is no end. And that is pretty scary. Because the problem is, there are literally tens of millions of people around the world who would love to come to this country if they could.

You know, several people have argued today that, "Well, these people are not economic refugees; they're political refugees; they're looking for freedom."

Well, all right. Fine. They're looking for freedom.

But look at this: Over 90 percent of the world's countries have nondemocratic forms of government. That's a fact. They don't have much freedom. Over 90 percent of the world's countries.

Does that mean that every single citizen of every nondemocratic country has a right to come here and say, "I don't have any freedom where I come from. I would love to come to America and share your freedom."

It's just not realistic, with over 90 percent of the countries being that way.

And there's the question, again, of how many within these countries have the right to complain that they don't have enough freedom? The population in Laos is about 3½ million. The population in Cambodia is about 5½ million. The population in Vietnam is about 54.7 million. Should we say that every person in these countries has a right to complain of lack of freedom and, therefore, demand refugee status and admission into America? [1]

That's a tough question.

AMERICANS NEED JOBS

I think, also, when we look at this situation, one of the basic questions we've got to deal with is this: Do we have a situation where there are, in a sense, extra jobs that these people can certainly fit into? The answer is no. Quite the opposite. We have extra people of our own with no jobs. Because the unemployment statistics, what they fail to show by their generalities is the unemployment problems of specific groups within America. As, for example, the legendary figures on, say, black teenagers.

Throughout this country—Des Moines is a typical case—over 30 percent of black teenagers can't get a job. And it's not entirely for

[1] But we have got to say "no" otherwise we are talking about millions more people.

lack of jobs. I've spoken with Mr. Arzania Williams, a very prominent black leader in Des Moines and head of the Gateway Community Center. His center sponsored seven refugee families, as a VOLAG. So they have done their piece for the refugee resettlement effort. And Williams said the experience was very instructive, because on the one hand, their primary constituency are the black people of Des Moines; but now, in addition, they had these seven refugee families. And they said the difference was incredible. Williams said to me, "People never came to us saying, 'Give me those black people you've got; we've got jobs for them.' " But suddenly, people came to us a lot saying, "Give me those refugees you've got; we've got jobs for them."

Arzania Williams has told me about many specific instances where refugees were bumped to the head of the line, so to speak, by way of job opportunities. And I submit to you, sir, that if anybody has a right to a job in America, it's an American citizen. If employers have jobs, there are many unemployed Americans who need them and who should have first crack at them.

It may be tragic that we don't have enough jobs for the entire world's population. But I do believe that it's a fact. Who should have first shot at the jobs we do have? As Arzania Williams put it, "If black people had a Colleen Shearer working for them, every one of my people would have a job." That's Mr. Williams' comment.

And I submit to you, in conclusion, that enough is enough.

Thank you for your time.

[The prepared statement of Michael K. Schutz follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MICHAEL K. SCHUTZ, PH. D.

A TIME FOR LIMITS:

THE IOWA REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM AND THE REALITIES OF AMERICA IN THE 1980'S

Honorable Senator, ladies and gentlemen. I am grateful for the opportunity to appear before you today. As my resume shows, I have been professionally involved and personally concerned about immigration issues for many years. My undergraduate work at the University of California, Berkeley and my Doctoral work at Northwestern both included a good deal of work in Demography, Population Studies, and Statistics.

The entire area of immigration into America is a most important subject, especially in these times of exceedingly high legal and illegal immigration. We will certainly continue to welcome some immigrants into this country. We can, we should, and we will. But the fundamental questions are, how many newcomers should we accept into this country and, how should we help these newcomers adjust to their new lives?

The Asian refugee question is a most important part of this total picture. So it is most appropriate that we come together to examine the Iowa Refugee Resettlement Program. This program and its people have become increasingly famous, for very good reasons, and we need to study their goals and their methods. As Colleen Shearer, Director of the Iowa Refugee Service Center, has often said, we need to look at the question of refugee resettlement and ask, "not why, but how." (I would suggest that ultimately, the question is not why, or even how, but how many. But we shall leave that aside for a moment.)

It is widely felt that Iowa's Asian Refugee Resettlement Program is one of the best in the nation. At the present time, there are about 7,800 refugees from Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia living in Iowa. They are settling in and adapting quite well, and there is very little public hostility between our present citizens and these future citizens.

We Iowans can take considerable pride in the fact that things have gone so well, and this success is no accident. From the very start, our program has been well thought out, well organized, and well executed. The support from Governor Ray has been extremely important, starting with his televised appeals to Iowans to accept these Asians in general, and to serve as refugee-sponsors whenever possible. I am in complete agreement with Colleen Shearer that the real key to Iowa's success lies in developing a jobs-orientation, rather than a social-services orientation, to the problem of refugee resettlement. If one asks, "who should be in charge of refugee resettlement?", too often the answer is, the institutions and agencies dealing with minorities, and the poor. Our answer is a far better one: Let's put the Iowa Department of Job Service in charge of refugee resettlement, so that we put refugees on a road towards employment not on a road towards welfare. Mike Mcgraw of the Des Moines Register wrote that Iowa "is the only state in which refugee programs have been given to the employment service rather than a welfare agency.[1] Furthermore, the Iowa program states that no refugees are to be admitted into the state unless they have an official sponsor, who will have certain specific responsibilities. The Iowa Refugee Service Center states that,

> The six requirements of sponsorship are as follows: sponsors are expected to provide (for newly arrived refugees) adequate housing, adequate clothing, food in the house, pocket money, medical examinations, and A JOB."[2] (emphasis in the original).

This is an excellent and unusual set of guidelines, and one tends to wish that the Iowa Refugee Service Center had resettled all of the Asian refugees here in Iowa, not just half of them.

Hopefully, the result of all this would be that the refugees could and would become employed, tax-paying members of the community, and no one would be able to accuse them of being mere parasites.

So goes the theory - how goes the practice? Rather well, all things considered. In many other parts of the country, serious problems have been developing. Speaking in Denver on February 25, 1980 before the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy, Colleen Shearer said that,

> Nearly five years into the resettlement program, the realities are...that a large percentage of the refugees are being brought into the United States without individual sponsors being assigned to them...that unsponsored refugees are truly left helpless among us and many times have no choice but welfare...the percentage of refugees utilizing cash assistance is increasing... (and) refugees are quitting jobs they have held for months and years in order to avail themselves of public assistance.[3]

But if Shearer talks about the nationwide "swing towards welfare by the refugees" (her expression), at least

one would hope that things would be different here in Iowa, given our very different sort of resettlement program. For several years, it seemed that the results in Iowa were different, at least for those refugees resettled by the Iowa Refugee Service Center. But now it is not so clear that Iowa is doing much better than average at getting and keeping refugees employed.

Precise figures are hard to come by, but the general impression comes through in various ways. For example, the Iowa Refugee Service Center publishes a magazine entitled The Iowa Orienting Express, designed to provide valuable information for Asian refugees. In the May, 1981 issue, the lead article was entitled, "Special Message to Southeast Asians in Iowa Who are Receiving Public Assistance." Here are a few pertinent sentences from that article:

> The State of Iowa has run out of cash assistance money for refugee assistance because so many refugees have applied to get cash assistance... There are many people who can work but who do not work because they would rather have the welfare check... If all refugees who could work would go to work, there would be enough money to help those who cannot work.[4]

The point seems clear; even here in Iowa, the "swing toward welfare" that Shearer talks about is becoming increasingly pronounced among the Asian refugees. And the special refugee assistance money is simply running out.

Throughout America, the refugees are becoming increasingly aware of and concerned about the limits of America's financial help to them. And they are right to be concerned, because our help to them must inevitably be limited. Our financial resources are certainly not limitless.

But there is an even greater irony here: even if every able-bodied refugee were to seek work, there would still be dramatic problems. Because at any given time, the number of available jobs is also finite, and therefore limited. The sad facts are, assistance monies are limited, but so is the number of available jobs. So the real-world question is this: How does the employment picture look today? And the answer, as we know all too well, is this: Rather poor, both on the national level, and here in Iowa.

Nationwide and in Iowa, too, the unemployment rates have been rising alarmingly - the nationwide rates for 1978 and 1979 were 6.0% and 5.8%, respectively. That is bad enough. But the figure for 1980 was 7.1%, and the projected unemployment rate for 1981 is 7.4%.[5] Traditionally, the unemployment rate for Iowans has been below the national average. The rates for 1978 and 1979 were 4.0% and 4.1%. But the rate for 1980 was 5.7%, and the projected rate for 1981 is 6.2%.[6] This means that over 90,000 Iowans in the labor force are not currently able to find jobs. And there is no indication that these rates are going to drop in the near future.

The implication of all this for the Refugee Resettlement Program is not very attractive. Sad to say, the refugees are caught in a double-bind, a real Catch-22. On the one hand, cash assistance funds are rapidly being exhausted, on both the Federal and State levels. This despite Colleen Shearer's best efforts to encourage refugees to seek cash employment, not cash assistance. The staff people at the Iowa Refugee Service Center know all too well that welfare monies are very limited, in this day and age. But the problem is, the supply of jobs is every bit as

limited as the supply of welfare money. We have an excellent resettlement program here, well designed and well administered. The problems are not at all the fault of the Iowa Refugee Service Center. They are doing the best they can, but the job market is simply getting overloaded.

The bottom line is this: America in general and Iowa in particular can only absorb a finite, limited number of refugees. One cannot say what is the exact maximum number of refugees we could absorb. But the implication appears to be that given current economic realities, we should probably not admit very many more, if any. Already, the Asian Refugee Program has grown tremendously, since its beginnings in 1975. At that time, it was expected that only about 130,000 Asian refugees in total would be brought in. But crisis after crisis developed in Southeast Asia. And as of the end of August, 1981, over 528,000 Southeast Asians have come into the U.S. And what of the next month, September, 1981? The answer is, over 20,000 more come in.[7]

As for the state of Iowa, the flow has been somewhat reduced in recent months. Whereas in 1979 and 1980, Iowa used to receive around 125 or more new refugees per month, the average in recent months has been less than 100, 92 to be exact. So, we have had a decrease of between 25% to 35%. But still, refugees continue to enter Iowa at least at 65% or about two-thirds of the previous rate.[8] I submit that this cannot go on forever.

Americans are a compassionate people, and we should be. But our welfare monies and our jobs are both limited, and we seem to have reached the limiting point on both. I feel that Asian refugee admissions into America and into Iowa should be greatly reduced at once.

In conclusion, let me say that this discussion of refugees connects to the area of immigration in general, including both illegal and legal immigration. In the past five years, since 1976, the immigration and naturalization service has apprehended over 1,000,000 illegal aliens nationwide, every year. And the apprehension figures are bound to gently underestimate the total number who enter illegally.[9] And remember, under current law, it is not illegal to knowingly employ illegal aliens. The implications of that little proviso are pretty obvious. Also, in 1980, legal immigration totaled over 800,000.

Apparently, there are still people in this country who believe that America can continue to admit unlimited numbers of new people. But, there are literally tens of millions of people throughout the entire world who would flock to this country if they could. Some people argue that any people from a poor country, or from a country with a non-democratic form of government, have the right to call themselves refugees, and to seek asylum in this country. But, sadly, billions of people throughout the world live in or near poverty conditions, by our standards, and about 90% of the world's countries have non-democratic governments. Should we literally allow all people from these poor or non-democratic countries to call themselves refugees? Please, let us be realistic.

If one stops and looks at the big picture, the overall, marco level reality, the plea for unlimited-access to this country becomes patently unrealistic, to say the least. Our resources and our jobs are clearly limited, and the unemployment rates for all Americans are terrible and getting worse. First and foremost, we owe our own citizens a chance to find a job. In many parts of this country, for

example, black teenage unemployment averages over 30%. Yet the staff at the Iowa Refugee Service Center say that they can find the Asian refugees plenty of jobs for which the employees do not even need to speak English. I greatly admire the dedication and the accomplishments of the people at the Iowa Refugee Service Center. They have done a tremendous job in finding work for the Asian refugees. But I would like to close with the words of Mr. Arzania Williams, a black leader in Des Moines and the Director of the Gateway Community Center. As Mr. Williams put it, "if black people had a Colleen Shearer working for them, everyone of my people would have a job."

Thank you for your time and attention.

REFERENCES:

1. "Iowa Refugee Plan Built Around Jobs", by Mike McGraw, labor writer for the Des Moines Register; Iowa Farm Business section, Des Moines Register; Sunday, June 17, 1979.

2. Iowa Refugee Service Center pamphlet, entitled "Services Provided to Refugees", dated November 30, 1979; page 4.

3. "Refugee Resettlement: Not Why, But How", by Colleen Shearer, Director, Iowa Department of Job Service and Director, Iowa Refugee Service Center, Des Moines; Testimony submitted to the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy; February 25, 1980, Denver, Colorado; page 6.

4. "Special Message to Southeast Asians In Iowa Who Are Receiving Public Assistance"; article appearing in the May, 1980 issue of The Iowa Orienting Express, published by the Iowa Refugee Service Center; pages 1 and 4.

5. Personal communication with Mr. Paul Hadlock, Economist and Statistician with the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C.

6. Ibid.

7. Personal communication with Mr. John Lloyd, Deputy Director of the Office of Asian Refugee Affairs, U.S. State Department, Washington, D.C.

8. Personal communication with Mr. Marvin Weidner, Manager, Iowa Refugee Service Center, Des Moines.

9. Personal communication with Mr. Theodore Giorgetti, Assistant District Director for Investigations, Chicago District Office, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Senator GRASSLEY. Now, I would like to go to questions.

Mr. Bellizzi, what is your opinion of the concept of front-loading services for refugees by providing 6 to 9 months of intensive English language and subsidized job placement in cooperation with the private sector, and how can the private sector be more effectively brought into the refugee resettlement program?

Mr. BELLIZZI. Well, you know, when you're dealing with the refugees who, right now, because so many years have gone by, that the refugees that we're seeing in our English-as-a-second-language class, have very limited skills. They're much different than they were years ago. And I don't know if that's true acorss Iowa, or across the United States. But it is true in our particular area, because of time.

It's our opinion, based upon the instruction we've given, that it does take several months—6 to 9 months—to do a reasonable job; up to 1 year, probably, to develop the kind of skills that those individuals need.

Now, in the case of the private sector, we have worked with many businesses and industries that have employed, in the past, refugees and have tried to develop within those plants and industries an English-as-a-second-language program.

In many cases what has happened, where those have been somewhat of a success, have been the refugees giving 1 hour of their time and the employer giving 1 hour of their time, and trying to put on the class sometime, for example, around 4 to 6 in the evening, for three of four evenings a week.

The problem, I think, with that is the fact that the limited time that you have to try to develop the kinds of skills that we think are necessary to really be proficient, is simply one of time. Six or eight hours a week, at maximum, will not develop the kind of skills that we can do, for example, in a full-time day program.

I guess it's my feeling that if people come over to this country and they are not able to get good jobs, jobs that in fact keep them off the welfare rolls, that perhaps initially it's important, then, to develop English skills. And that may mean that, temporarily, they have to have some kind of a cash assistance, or someone has to provide some kind of funding for them so that they can get the kind of intensive kind of care that they need, so that in the long term they do become self-sufficient through jobs—assuming that those jobs are available.

The private sector has been involved as members of advisory committees for the purpose of developing ideas for job possibilities for those individuals. Our position at the college is that we're not in our adult education program, responsible for finding jobs for those individuals, but, rather, in supplying educational kinds of programs for those individuals.

I don't know if I answered your question.

Senator GRASSLEY. You did. Thank you.

Roger, in what industries are refugees employed, who have arrived since 1975? I need a general answer to that. You don't have to give a definitive one.

Mr. HERR. I have no data to support it, but it is my understanding that many of our refugees are employed in entry-level, service-type occupations.

I think that question should also be directed at Colleen Shearer, to substantiate it. But that's my understanding.

I would like to make the comment, in regard to a statement as far as jobs to keep people off welfare rolls, that with implementation of eligibility tied to 150 percent of a State standard of need, effective 10-1, a full-time job at minimum wage precludes anyone from entering the welfare system, unless you have many, many, many, many children.

For example, a typical ADC case is a family of 3—actually, 2.7, but we'll round the child to 3. That translates to $540 a month as being the eligibility cutoff. That's gross income, without consideration of any work expense, child care—or you name it.

Minimum wage, working full time—even less than full time—exceeds this dollar amount.

So I just wanted to clarify that for the record.

Senator GRASSLEY. OK. Do you have any idea of how Iowa's dependency rate for welfare—dependency rate for the refugees, compares to that of other States?

Mr. HERR. No. But I gave a figure of 40 percent, and——

Senator GRASSLEY. We have an average of 67 percent.

Mr. HERR. Well, but you always have to look in terms of definitions. I think that 67 percent includes not only what is commonly thought of as welfare—and that's a check to somebody—but also medicaid, which many people separate out as welfare, et cetera.

I'm just addressing cash assistance, where we submit checks to people.

The data that I have, of course Iowa is 40 percent on a national level, and this is taken from the "Refugee Report," which is a publication of APWA, American Public Welfare Association, that in November 1980, which is the most current, the percent of people—refugees—receiving cash assistance is 49.3. Now this is looking at the national level. And here I'm sure we have excluded medical assistance cases. Iowa, therefore, shows being approximately 10 percent under the national level.

Ms. MILDER. The 67-percent figure came out of the consultation back in Washington.

Mr. HERR. These statistics are always hard to use, because you never know where people are coming from with their definitions.

Senator GRASSLEY. Dr. Schutz, you mentioned about refugees taking jobs away from American citizens, but isn't it a fact that refugees and other immigrants—legal or illegal—today take jobs that American citizens don't really want, or won't do?

Dr. SCHUTZ. That's a very fair question, Senator, and that point has been made for years.

I come from California, originally, where we had the Bracero program in the fifties, and sixties, to bring in Mexicans to do stoop labor, and the argument always was, "Well, this is a backbreaking, unpleasant labor; these people are used to it, and no American would do that job; therefore, we've got to have these people."

But that thinking just doesn't wash. The Braceros were being paid 80 cents an hour.

So if you say, "How many Americans will do stoop labor?" that's not the fair question. The question is: "How many will do stoop labor at 80 cents an hour?"

Because we have demonstrated in California that if you raise those wages to some kind of living level, plenty of our own people will take those jobs.

In San Francisco, having a job in the garbage department is a very highly prized job, because it pays extremely well. Maybe it pays too well. Well, that may be the case. But in any event, people will take those jobs.

So I would submit to you that immigration—illegal and legal immigration—certainly has a wage-depressing effect, so that if one argues, "Well, we can't replace these immigrants with American citizens because they won't take the jobs," we're missing the point there. Not at those particular wages; but their wages are set at an artificially depressed level because of the availability of a cheap labor source.

And maybe that's not fair to the American working people.

That's one answer I have to that. It may not cover all the possible aspects of this issue——

Senator GRASSLEY. No. I appreciate that.

These are all the questions I have for this panel.

Thank you all very much for your points of view, and I invite—I know that Dr. Schutz and Murray Drake, because of their interest on committees they serve on, will probably be in touch with us; but, Mr. Bellizzi and Roger, I invite you, too, if you have any additional things as time goes on, to contact me.

I'd say January or February of next year we'll be redrafting the immigration laws and I know the chairman does want to present a bill to the full committee, so please keep in touch with us.

Thank you very much.

[Brief recess.]

Senator GRASSLEY. Our next panel consists of Mr. Houng, who is a former Tai Dam refugee, and his family was the first to be resettled by the Iowa Refugee Service Center, and the first one who became citizens. He's been involved in refugee resettlement since his arrival in 1975, and he's served on one of the community action boards.

Mr. Somsak is a former Lao refugee, who has also been involved in the Iowa resettlement program since 1975. Mr. Somsak is practically a native of Iowa. He received his B.S. degree from Iowa State University. Following his education, he returned to Laos, to become the principal of the first Lao-language high school in Laos.

And, finally, Rev. James Nelson, who serves as associate pastor at Grace United Methodist Church. Reverend Nelson got involved early on in the Iowa resettlement effort, since his church resettled its first family in 1975.

So I look forward to the testimony of each one of you, and I would suggest that you go in the order of the introduction; so, would you like to be first, Mr. Houng?

STATEMENT OF HOUNG BACCAM, FORMER TAI DAM REFUGEE

Mr. HOUNG. Thank you, Senator.

My name is Houng Baccam, a former Tai Dam refugee, working with the Iowa Refugee Service Center since 1975. I am very hon-

ored to be allowed to testify before you about the refugee resettlement program.

When you heard "Tai Dam refugee," you might wonder, where did they come from? Who were they?

Please allow me to explain to you briefly about the Tai Dam people.

Thirty years ago, we had a tiny country called the Twelve Tai States, located between South China, North Laos, and Northwest Vietnam. But our country has been run over by the Communist Vietnamese in 1952 and became North Vietnam since then.

Tai Dam means Black Tai, because of the black dressing of their women. The Tai Dam are called professional refugees, because they have run from the Communists so many years. As being the first victim of the Communist invasion, the Tai Dam survived by escaping from town to town, from country to country, in Southeast Asia.

When I was young, the same age of my older son, my father showed to me a picture in the newspaper of orphan kids victimized by the Korea war in 1951. My father used to mention about the war destroys the family. He was scared about family separation like the picture.

In 1952, we fled our country to North Vietnam. When North Vietnam became Communist in 1954, we fled to the country of Laos.

In 1975, in the eve of South Vietnam's collapse to the Communists, it happened to me to see on the Time magazine a picture published on the cover—two Vietnamese children in the baby-lift program. I showed the picture to my children, the same as my father did 24 years ago. I was scared with the same feeling like my father.

In May 1975, I had to take my family across the Mekong River to escape Communists in Laos. The Tai Dam group were the first refugees to come out of Laos. They were not allowed to take asylum in the United States until they pleaded their cause as the first victims of the Vietnamese Communist invasion in our own country in 1952. As pioneer refugees, we set up our camp in a border temple in Thailand. Our number amounted to about 2,500 people in 5 months. We wrote 30 letters to 30 Governors in the United States.

Only Gov. Robert Ray responded to our appeal, by accepting the first Tai Dam group into Iowa. Six hundred were accepted by Iowa. The rest remained in the camp and many families were separated. Left behind were all close relatives such as parents, grandparents, sons, daughters, brothers and sisters, et cetera. Now Iowa has 2,300 Tai Dam. Some of our relatives have gone to France, and only less than 500 are still in Nong Khai camp in Thailand.

With the experience of refugee life and the natural hard-working spirit, the Tai Dam in Iowa have built successfully a reputation in their new life.

Why the Tai Dam resettlement program was successful:

The Tai Dam was the most miserable people in the world. They had tried to survive in their country until the invaders occupied their homeland and threatened their lives. They used to escape from town to town to avoid the battles. They had been forgotten by the world. After they were chased out of their country, they always worked hard to provide security for their families.

When they were in Iowa, their first wish was getting a job. Then a shelter for the family. Being non-English speaking, they could communicate with the gesture language. They accepted any job at any wage. With the help of Iowa Refugee Service Center and the local sponsor group, the Tai Dam have learned more and more about Iowa and the United States. As soon as they got the job, they became taxpayers, part of their neighborhood, and good citizens of this society.

After being in this country for a certain period, the Tai Dam were eager to change from their refugee status to permanent resident alien, then to U.S. citizen, as myself. I have been very proud to be a citizen of this great country. I wish this society would accept us as your neighbors. I could change my status, but not the color of my skin and my face. But I ask you to accept my existence in this society. We should learn from one another to build this super country.

The refugee resettlement program must be shared by every level of the society such as Federal, State, local government, and private organizations.

In Iowa, the Iowa Refugee Service Center has been running very successfully because of the commitment of sponsorship, the providing of human services, volunteer services, and followup.

For the funding, the Iowa Refugee Service Center receives Federal funds which come from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the U.S. Department of State. No State dollars are used for the Iowa Refugee Service Center.

To improve nationwide on the refugee resettlement program, we should look at each program and make our choice which one will be the best for implementing on a national level, such as: Local sponsorship; sponsor orientation; followup—resettlement, employment, education; volunteer tutor program; mutual assistance association.

Senator, I would like to conclude my testimony here, and thank you for your attention.

Senator GRASSLEY. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Houng Baccam follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HOUNG BACCAM

Refugee Resettlement Program:

Before discussing refugee resettlement, we should begin with a definition. In a simple meaning, a refugee means a person who has been fear of persecution and fled the country for seeking a safe place to be "resettled" or to be "re-established" in residence.

The refugee was risking their life to escape from their native country and to the country of first asylum. During their staying in the refugee camp, they were told to ask asylum in a third country as they wished.

The refugees were eligible to resettle in a free country when their status were selected by a resettlement program of the third countries such as Australia, Canada, France, United States, West Germany, etc.

Success of Iowa Resettlement Program:

To face the exodus of Indochinese refugees in U.S. soil, Iowa was one of the fifty states who accepted refugees.

In the late of 1975, Governor Robert D. Ray had assigned Mrs. Colleen Shearer to set up a task force for Indochinese resettlement to take care of the Tai Dam group. In 1976, this Task Force became the Iowa Refugee Service Center to look after the whole Indochinese refugee (Cambodian, Hmong, Lowland Lao, Tai Dam and Vietnamese).

To control refugees in the public assistance, the Iowa Refugee Service Center has directed to its staff to encourage refugees to follow the Center's philosophy: "This country gives the refugees only two things...entry into the country and the opportunity to make their own way in a free society."

The first wave of refugees arrived to Iowa in the late of 1975. They were six hundred Tai Dam, escaped many times from many Indochinese countries. In 1976, under the family reunification program, six hundred more Tai Dam arrived to Iowa. These 1,200 Tai Dam have the voluntary agency (volag), the Iowa Refugee Service

Center. None was in the welfare because the monitoring was intense and the group of sponsors was very strong to support the family during their transition.

Very thirsty about making a new life, the Tai Dam people was rushed to the job market since their arrival to this state. With the help of their sponsor they found the job very easily because they accepted any job at any wage. They earned the minimum wages but with two or three members in the family working, they supported fairly their family. They could buy a new car and a house for the family in the period of fourteen months.

You might wonder why a new car, because with no English they couldn't communicate with the garage man when their car was broken down--or they didn't know how to notice (notify) the employer when their car didn't start. But they got the cars so they could work.

What about buying a house in a short period? The Tai Dam were very attached to the family. When they were tight and crowded in the family (average, six) it was difficult to rent a house--it's better to buy a house. If a family wanted to buy a house and didn't have enough money for the down payment, the head of household could go to the relatives for the contribution of some money to make the down payment. Next time it will be his or her turn to pay back without any interest. So that is why the Tai Dam in Iowa have about 85% own their own house. And more than that have their own car.

Looking at the success of the Iowa resettlement program we should apply the same policy to the new refugee program in the U.S. Since 1979, the new wave of refugees have spoiled the Iowa policy because the new refugees' attitudes liked to compare themselves to the old refugees. They were eager to have everything like the old families. They didn't think how much strength and length of time that the old refugees had built up to these successes. They were told welfare monies will give more than working at a job. They turned to the welfare system, which allowed them to have the

same level of living as the old refugees, without working. Also, the employer attitudes toward refugees have been changed, because of the experience of communication with refugees. When new refugees applied for job, many employers requested the English-speaking refugees. With this excuse, the new refugees preferred to go to school. We might say the welfare system makes the newcomers to be abusers.

The Funding:

The Department of State allows the voluntary agencies (volags) to collect $500 per head of refugee. Iowa Refugee Service Center receives the same amount for the refugee resettlement. So the Iowa Refugee Service Center conducts its business utilizing federal money from two sources--the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and the U.S. Department of State. No state dollars are used for the Iowa refugee program.

The first source of money is that which is appropriated by U.S. Congress for the refugee assistance program. This money is allocated to HHS where it is divided among the states to serve refugees. In Iowa, the Iowa Refugee Service Center, which is attached to the Iowa Department of Job Service, is the "single state agency" under the "state plan" concept required by HHS. The Iowa Refugee Service Center receives the federal money and then contracts with other state agencies to deliver refugee services.

Iowa's Program May Be Implemented On A National Level:

We should admit the difficulty of refugee resettlement in this country. To improve the program, we should pick up a successful program and compare one to another. As the experience of Iowa program shows, we need to implement a uniform policy to require all volags to apply as following:

Sponsorship -- Individual sponsors must be assigned to every refugee ready to come to this country.

Sponsor Training -- A new sponsor has to be trained. An old sponsor with the past experience can share with the new sponsor.

Refugee Orientation -- Before being brought into this country, refugees must go through an orientation session taught by experienced Indochinese resettlement agents.

Follow-up -- Once the refugees are resettled with the help of sponsors, we need to continue to monitor not only the refugee families after their arrival in Iowa, but also the sponsor groups. It is not unusual to find that the language barrier causes some real communication problems and we need to know that from the sponsor. As the sponsor attempts to solve the refugee family's problems, the volag should be available with advice as where to go and how to work through a situation. The culture shock is real and it works both ways.

Volunteer Tutor Program -- The Iowa Refugee Service Center's Volunteer Tutor Program was started in June, 1979. The program was designed to supplement English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) classes and to broaden the support for the entire refugee program in Iowa. Many concerned individuals have wanted to aid the refugees but were not able to make the commitment required of a sponsor, so they have welcomed this opportunity. Federal and state funds are limited for educational programs and the Volunteer Tutor Program has been an effective way of meeting the refugees' English language needs without utilizing any tax money that later could be unavailable.

Refugee Mutual Assistance Association Groups -- The refugees came to the U.S. six years ago, some of them became U.S. citizens. To maintain their own identification and to preserve their own culture heritage, the refugees have formed their own associations, or Mutual Assistance Associations (MAAs). With this self-help group, the refugee community will take care of their own people when dissolution of resettlement programs occur.

The entire refugee program should cooperate between federal, state and local government. Current and projected work force needs should be located. To avoid the overcrowded refugees in certain locations, refugees should be required to remain in the location of their initial resettlement for a certain period of time. Some rule must be applied for this.

Senator GRASSLEY. Mr. Somsak?

STATEMENT OF SOMSAK SAYTHONGPHET, FORMER LAO REFUGEE

Mr. SOMSAK. Thank you, Senator.

My name is Somsak Saythongphet. I am originally from Laos. I have been involved in the State of Iowa refugee program from its beginning in 1975.

My statement this morning is a shortened version of my submitted testimony, because I found it was too long for the time allowed.

Senator GRASSLEY. Your complete testimony will be printed in the record.

Mr. SOMSAK. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, for all the refugees from Southeast Asia I am honored and pleased to have an opportunity to testify before you at this hearing. I testify today not only as a refugee who has experienced the resettlement program in this country, but as one who works every day with refugees and know their thoughts and uncertainties; their questions and opinions.

This country is over 6 years into its Indochinese refugee resettlement program. The refugee resettlement in the United States is primarily undertaken by American people on a voluntary basis, who act through their resettlement agencies.

From 1975 to the present, the American people will surely have provided millions of donated dollars, clothing, food and services, exclusive of services and funding provided by the Government.

Because of these efforts undertaken by the American people, the majority of the refugees who came here in 1975 have been resettled in material comfort and are self-sufficient, if not prospering. Only a relatively small percentage of these refugees are still on welfare or receiving other forms of public assistance. A good number of refugee families now have a TV, if not a color TV, one or two cars, and one or even two houses. They are indeed contributing to the country's economy.

The American people will continue to accept refugees because they feel that it is morally right. They will continue to do so as long as the refugees are not going to be a public burden and if the refugees are not going to take jobs away from them.

You may have heard over and over again of the industriousness of the Indochinese people. Because of this trait, the Indochinese have acclimated quite rapidly. They are willing to accept any jobs. Most of them got jobs, even though the jobs open to them were, for the most part, lower level, offering little pay and few opportunities for advancement.

But with the combined income, the family is far more than self-sufficient, enough to give them a good start.

With the proper introduction by the sponsoring group to the employer, limited English proficiency appears to have become less an obstacle. Most of them who cannot understand English are nevertheless employed. With long exposure to American people, and the mass media, it seems only a matter of time until the great majority are functionally fluent in English.

In order for the Federal Government to foster the continuation of successful refugee resettlement, voluntary agencies must be required to provide individual sponsors for each refugee family and jobs should be emphasized, rather than training. The refugee self-help groups, or mutual assistance associations, should be brought in to assist the resettlement of new arrivals.

Their role could have a major impact for improvement in the refugee program. Their activities do play a very important role in the everyday lives of their members.

At present, most mutual assistance associations offer services on a voluntary basis with little or no funding base. The voluntary agencies and the service providers throughout the country should invite their local mutual assistance associations to become more involved in helping to provide assistance. A greater portion of available refugee funds should be granted to mutual assistance associations so they can develop the capacity to carry out these programs of necessary adjustment, to live in the United States.

That is about the extent of the statement I would like to make orally, Mr. Chairman, and I would invite your attention to my written statement.

Thank you for allowing me this opportunity to express my concerns.

Senator GRASSLEY. Thank you for giving not only me, personally, the subcommittee, and as the record will be available to the entire Senate, the benefit of your experience, not only of being intimately involved in the program, but your recollections for us of what it is like to be a new American.

[The prepared statement of Somsak Saythongphet follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SOMSAK SAYTHONGPHET

As one of the Indochinese refugees who has been involved in the State of Iowa refugee resettlement program from its beginning in 1975, I wish to express my appreciation for the opportunity to present my views on refugee resettlement today.

For the last six years I have served as one of the staff at the Iowa Refugee Service Center, which resettles refugees as a voluntary agency (volag) under contract with the U.S. Department of State, as well as functioning as a clearing-house and referral and service center for all of Iowa's refugees under contract with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

I speak today not only as a refugee who has experienced the resettlement program in this country, but as one who works every day with refugees and knows their thoughts and uncertainties; their questions and opinions.

I am a Lao refugee, but today I speak for all the refugees from Southeast Asia who made such a hard decision to leave all that was so precious to them because communism was not something to read about in the newspapers, but because communism was right outside the door and to leave the house was to invite imprisonment, torture any maybe death. I speak as a refugee whose plight was so uncertain as to mean the fear of not even being left with a house or a job or even a family.

We are all thankful for the tremendous efforts of federal, state and local governments and we are thankful to the voluntary agencies for the efforts to resettle approximately half a million Indochinese refugees. We are thankful for the wonderful job and the contributions of church congregations and other organizations and private citizens throughout America for helping refugees settle in this great land of freedom and hope.

We thank you for ourselves and our children and for their children and for all who will be born of us in succeeding genera-

tions who will be Indochinese-Americans and not just Indochinese. You have given us our lives and our future.

Considering the cultural differences between the Indochinese and Americans, this program is probably one of the most difficult the federal government has ever tried to implement within the boundaries of the United States. To blend the international with the domestic adds to the difficulty of such a program. Many different agencies have tried many different ways to resettle the Indochinese people. As a refugee and as a service provider, I can make some comparisons of the different programs.

I am proud to be a part of the Iowa program because of its many successes. One of the key ingredients for the efficiency of this program is the use of a system of matching refugee families with American sponsors.

During the early stages in 1975, most refugees being resettled in the U.S. were matched by their volags with American sponsors. Unfortunately, some of the volags have not continued this practice. We estimate that perhaps half of the refugees now in the U.S. do not have American sponsors.

American sponsors have the resources and contacts to help the refugees become self-sufficient quickly, by placing them into jobs as soon as possible. American sponsors are able to give them direction and although most of the early refugees were from the higher levels of Indochinse society they took lower level jobs. But, with combined incomes within families they were able to satisfy their needs for basic living. They are working their way up the ladder and now very few of them receive any kind of public assistance at all. They are contributing taxpayers in the U.S. economic system.

Now we are receiving refugees from the lower levels of Indochinese society. But the emphasis should be the same. Jobs are the key. The English language should not be a barrier to job placement. These refugees can also start at a lower level. There

is no such thing as a dead-end job. Any job is a stepping stone to a better job.

In Iowa, where we have found good sponsors, many refugees have been employed with limited English ability. The sponsors have made the proper introductions to potential employers and many have served as a middle-man during the initial employment. The refugee then works and studies English that is related to the job.

I cannot stress enough the importance of having capable sponsors. Many agencies have ignored the need for American sponsorships and have added additional burdens to Indochinese families who are already struggling by assigning them as sponsors for their relatives. Some voluntary agencies use relatives who are unemployed and on welfare as sponsors. This creates an additional burden on our welfare rolls and causes public resentment toward refugees.

Perhaps big companies that need a continuing supply of workers could become sponsors for a number of refugees. This would create employment and provide training while the employers receive reimbursement from refugee resettlement funds as a sponsor. The employers would also get a good loyal work force.

English language training should go hand in hand with employment. This could be done with the cooperation of the employer. For example, a refugee could work alongside an American, learning the job skill and then attending English classes on the premises, classes which are geared to language and vocabulary necessary for the job.

Another arrangement could be a job-sharing system whereby two refugees share the same job. They would each work half time and study English the other half. Both would be paid a full salary and the employer would be reimbursed through refugee assistance funds. A benefit to the employer should be a tax deduction for taking part in the job training process.

There is another matter that I want to bring to your attention which I believe could have a major impact for improvement in the

refugee program. That is the role of the refugee self-help groups, or Mutual Assistance Associations (MAAs).

Unlike other immigrant groups, the Indochinese who arrived in the early years of the resettlement found no indigenous ethnic community to give them emotional or material support. Thus, the refugees throughout the U.S. have had the tendency to band together to help each other, resolve common problems and offer mutual support in difficult circumstances. They have organized to offer psychological, socio-cultural and economic support to their respective communities.

During the past six years, more than five hundred of these refugee Mutual Assistance Associations have been established within Indochinese refugee communities across the United States. These groups have formed in response to needs perceived and identified by the refugees themselves, rather than to needs identified by the Americans who resettle them. Such groups existed in Southeast Asia, although in slightly different form. The pagoda in Cambodia and Laos and the village temple in Vietnam functioned as community centers for spiritual, social, cultural and educational activities.

There has been widespread recognition of this critical role played by Vietnamese, Cambodian and Lao organizations at national and local levels in assisting the resettlement of new arrivals and self-help activities are becoming more focused and formalized over time. Their spheres of activity range from assisting assessment efforts to directly providing social adjustment services. The MAAs are the best example of refugee community initiatives in addressing refugee needs. These initiatives are extremely creative, cost effective and culturally sensitive. These activities must continue to be encouraged and supported by American host communities in order to provide a better level of service and to get more effective service for the dollars spent. It is a fact that there are many services now being provided by Americans which could be

better provided by Southeast Asians themselves and with less money than is being spent at the present time.

These activities play a very important role in the day-to-day lives of each Indochinese individual if properly planned with the right agencies and concerned authorities. Services which could be better provided for Indochinese by Indochinese are in the area of cultural activities and/or other social services such as native language counseling, orientation, outreach and information and referral and translation services. MAAs bring valuable language ability and cultural sensitivity to refugee service provision and are frequently the first source of outside help to be contacted by a refugee in need. Most MAAs offer services on a voluntary basis with little or no funding base.

During fiscal year 1981, a small amount of refugee assistance money was made available for only twenty-two of the more than five hundred MAAs to increase their capacity to be more involved in resettlement activities within their respective communities. The special financial assistance to MAAs, provided by the federal government from refugee assistance funds, has been money well spent. The voluntary agencies and the service providers throughout the country should invite their local MAAs to become more involved in helping to provide assistance. They can be brought in to assist in cross-cultural orientation because they have been through that themselves. They can provide psychological help, job finding assistance and training programs. A greater portion of whatever refugee funds will be available should be granted to the MAAs so they can develop the capacity to carry out these programs of necessary adjustments to live in the United States.

The history of America is a documentation of successful immigration and refugee resettlement. Immigrants bring new ideas, enthusiasm and creativity to the American system. This is a factor that has allowed America to remain a vigorous, growing, divergent society. I don't think Americans really want to become

a decaying and immobile society. That is why it is important to invest in refugees now. Where would we be if we hadn't invested in Albert Einstein and Jonas Salk? We all know that the refugees hold promise for the future of America. What is our economic loss if a refugee student now in a university somewhere can contribute significantly to discovering a cure for cancer?

We need to invest now so that we can reap the benefits in the future. Our children need sound educational programs. They have great intellectual ability and our schools need to focus more directly on their adjustment problems. They need native language assistance during the first stages of their education in the United States. MAAs can be of tremendous assistance to our children who will emerge as future benefits to American society.

I hope that the federal government will assist refugees to take charge of their own lives by focusing more on the resettlement agencies that have shown successful employment records, providing more assistance for MAAs and to investigate which kinds of educational program are sound.

You know and I know that the greatest beneficiaries of this program will be the American society itself.

Again, thank you for allowing me this opportunity to express my concerns.

Senator GRASSLEY. Reverend Nelson?

STATEMENT OF REV. JAMES R. NELSON, ASSOCIATE PASTOR, GRACE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH, DES MOINES, IOWA

Reverend NELSON. Thank you, Senator.

Coming last, I'm not sure whether I'm the cleanup batter or the janitor, I suppose, at this point, but there are some things that I would like to speak to. You have my written testimony.

To underscore just a little bit of where I come from, I would lift out of that testimony the fact that Grace Church, for whom I've been a pastor now for 9 years, has helped to resettle 32 refugees, coming basically out of two main families. Along with that, we have found ourselves to be a kind of center or godparents, as it were, for other refugees who have settled within our neighborhood, and even within the city, and who have related themselves to the refugees we've settled—kind of being a clearinghouse for that. In each case, outside of our own sponsorship, these have been individuals or families who have come here without sponsorship, and who have physically been left to fend a little bit by themselves. Lacking sponsorship, they have sought somebody, some organization or some means by which they could get through the systems.

I believe in sponsorship as a key element in the whole resettlement program, and I think it's been stated rather abundantly through other testimony that sponsorship seems to have made a difference in the program. I believe in sponsorship, and all that goes with it.

I was just writing some notes—I didn't include all the things that we do as sponsors, but—this is aside from my testimony—I think it ought to be understood that we really do our best to do a job as sponsors, and in the process of that there are some things that are corollary. We save a lot of money for the taxpayers.

In the testimony that I sent to you by way of your office, my addition is wrong. I'm not very good with figures; that's not my bag. But in the written testimony, I indicated that taking our very first family, in 1975, a family of 10, which is a little bit extraordinary in size—we figured, as a church, we spent somewhere around $5,000 to $6,000 in terms of goods given—furniture, utensils, provisions. We paid rent, for example, for the first year for the family, because they were not able to do that, and we did not want to get into the welfare program to do that.

The volunteer hours that were needed just to set the family up in a residence, see that they got to schools, and transportation and everything that was involved in that, even helping them purchase a car—all these things that were involved, that was about the round figure that we spent.

And if you add that out—if I can find it in the testimony here—if you add that out across the number of families that have been resettled in Iowa, Iowans alone have given about $3.7 million in time and energy and services, and just volunteer labor. If you multiply that out—and here's where my correction comes, from the written testimony that you received—across the Nation, about half of the refugees have had sponsors; in other words, about 250,000 have had sponsors. The average family being around 5; divide 5 into 250,000,

and you come up with 50,000. And you multiply that by the average of about $5,000 per family, and you come up with a figure that neighbors $250 million that sponsors have provided.

Now, that's kind of a shock, but I think it's pretty close to what has been given by the American people.

People are willing to do that.

We felt called by our church to do that, because of what we are. We've more than just a pile of bricks on the corner of Cottage Grove and 37th Street. We feel as though, because we are what we are, because we are in a country that displays an invitation, "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free," that if that doesn't mean anything to us, maybe we ought to remove that and build a fence to keep them out. But I think it means something to the American people to be able to do that, and to be able to share the resources that we have, to be able to reach out to people and be what we are.

You know, I think of myself. My name is Nelson. Everyone in the room can think of their own name. My name is Nelson. That name can be traced in its heritage through Nova Scotia, to Great Britain. I'm not a native of this country, really. My heritage does not ultimately rest here. It comes because there was somebody willing to give someone in my family—I don't even know who it is now; that's all been lost in the distant past—someone gave someone in my family a little enrichment—a job, some help, and encouraged them. So I'm here. I daresay there isn't anybody in this room who can say otherwise.

When this country cannot do that, we're in trouble.

Now I know we've got some economic problems, and I know we've got job problems and all that. I was interested in Dr. Schutz' testimony about jobs. I think one of the things that he neglected to get from the Department of Labor was the fact that there is a projected shortage by the mideighties of a work force.

Now, I'm not a statistical person, and I think I pointed that out earlier. If I believed in statistics, I wouldn't believe in the Christian Church, because we started out with 1 plus 12, and look where we are. And I hope we're going to do a little bit more than that, too.

But there obviously is some kind of projection for the mideighties. I'd like to hear about that from somewhere.

I'd also like to underscore the fact that maybe his testimony, in particular, points out the fact that there is a need for more sponsored resettlement, because the sponsored resettlement certainly has done a better job of things. Perhaps it also underscores your own interest in seeing that we approach the international community on a level that we might be able to help eliminate the necessity of immigration here. I applaud that.

I think another aspect of the success factor with the use of sponsors is the fact that we've been able to provide a link between two cultures. One of the greatest things that's happened to me is to be able to count these two gentlemen on my left as good friends of mine, and others like them. We have 32 friends—30 friends; we had 2 people who have died within the families that we have resettled. So we have 30 friends within the church, plus a whole bevy of others who have said, "These people helped, and we're going to look to them for some help."

I think the responsibility that a sponsor has, to give leadership by example is something that a sponsor needs to look at and say, "You know, what am I really doing? What am I saying to people by what I am and what I do?" The sponsor's assistance in helping to move through the systems—and, by the way, there are a lot of them, and some of them aren's easy to move through—that's an invaluable thing.

I would see that a refugee would be totally lost with the problems of language, transportation, and everything else that needs to take place, in just moving through some systems.

The educational system—people are willing to help, but if you don't know where to go you can't get the help.

The social services system—they're the nicest folks in the world, but unless you know how to go through the system, it's pretty tenuous and pretty difficult.

I think the way that we can provide a friendly ear, the support, the answers to questions—is a valuable thing.

Being able to absorb the gratitude of those who find a new opportunity in life is something that's very special for Americans to experience. Being a sponsor is an uplifting kind of enterprise and experience.

To see a family mature in social and economic development, working toward citizenship, where they can be providers instead of being provided for, is a good thing to see and experience, too.

I am totally encouraged by what we have done in Iowa. You probably know that the United Methodist Church itself has its own refugee resettlement program through the United Methodist Committee on Overseas Relief. We do this through Church World Services. In our church we have decided not to follow that program, but to follow the Iowa refugee resettlement program, simply because of the tremendous job that they do, and the feeling we have that we can go to them and get help when we need it. Fortunately, we haven't needed it all that much. But I know they're there when I need them. And that's something worth counting on.

I have no further testimony, Senator, but I'm glad for the opportunity to be here.

Senator GRASSLEY. You've been connected with this since 1975, with the same church?

Reverend NELSON. Oh, yes.

Senator GRASSLEY. OK. Thank you. You were using an example of a family during your testimony, and I'd like to know, did that family ever draw cash assistance?

Reverend NELSON. The first refugees that we had, that we resettled, did not draw any kind of cash assistance whatsoever. The last family—we resettled two complete families of 10, and then odds and ends of other relations in between, along there—the last family of 10 were receiving cash assistance, just the basic things—medical—title 19, and two boys were within the Job Corps program. They also received some food stamp assistance, initially. The family was on the verge of even breaking off from the title 19 program when the father died, very suddenly, at work. He was, in fact, really doing well. The family of eight boys and one girl, and a mother and a father was doing well.

At that particular point, we saw no other way to go around helping to provide for the mother and the children without some kind of cash assistance. Now they have been receiving cash assistance for a time. At this particular moment, we're looking for the time when the young men in the family, who have just completed work for the Job Corps—will be able to provide for the mother and their brothers and sisters.

So we have used the program. It's the only case in which we have used it. But if it hadn't been there, we would have been hard-pressed to have been able to do it all ourselves.

Now the church did a fantastic job of that. In fact, one of the men in the church who has taken responsibility for the family, is a part of our fellowship here today. Without his effort and the effort of other people who have responded to him, it wouldn't have been possible.

Senator GRASSLEY. Would you like to introduce him?

Reverend NELSON. I certainly would. W. T. Wehrle. Where are you?

[Mr. Wehrle standing.]

Reverend NELSON. He's an important person to us.

Senator GRASSLEY. What suggestion would you make on methods to reduce dependency rates?

Reverend NELSON. One thing that's being done right now that is important, and has been pointed out all morning—and part of the afternoon, is the real close relationship between the Job Service Center and the refugee resettlement program.

The name of the game is jobs. Dr. Schutz is correct in that. It is jobs. But the jobs are there. The use of Job Corps programs, WIN program, CETA I think have been very valuable. Whatever we can do to continue funding those at a level that help the local governments and the local agencies continue in that kind of a program I think would be very valuable for us.

Senator GRASSLEY. How can we convince more private citizens to become sponsors?

Reverend NELSON. Find more people like W. T. Wehrle and others like him, who are willing to see the special things that happen between persons of different cultures. It's an educational process. You need to know and experience, yourself, the way people develop themselves and do so well. It really encourages me to see what refugees can do for themselves. But also it encourages me when I see people want to become involved and I have been asked many, many times across this city and in some other communities to go and talk to churches who are wanting to sponsor, and want to know what's all involved.

There is a lot involved. It's very detailed. Some of it's awful headachy. But it's possible to be done. And I think some kind of an educational process, wherein people can understand that what is to be done can be done, and there are some people who can help you do it—not necessarily all of the social services outlets; that, I don't think, is nearly as important as the kinds of people that are in, like, the Iowa Refugee Service Center, who are there and stand by ready to help you with whatever kind of problem. I've called them up for some real dumb things, but they've accepted that for what it

is and been able to assist me beautifully in every single case that I know of.

Senator GRASSLEY. Thank you very much, Reverend Nelson.

[The prepared statement of Rev. Nelson follows:]

Prepared Statement of Rev. James R. Nelson

Gentlemen and Mesdames:

I am pleased to be offered this opportunity to testify on the matter of refugee resettlement, and to represent the many sponsors who have given untold hours of time, energy, and resources in order to meet one of the most perplexing and poignant needs to face human history. Refugees, like the poor, seem to be with every age, and with this age of rapid movement of both information and persons, our awareness is ever so much greater, and the dire needs of persons that much more publicized.

I am hopeful that the ideas generated here and elsewhere will produce viable proceedures and policies that will be of greatest value for the refugees in their resettlement as well as for the many agencies, organizations, and citizens who have assumed responsibilities in this area.

You may be interested in the credentials which bring me to this forum. I would offer the following for your consideration:

I serve as an associate pastor at Grace United Methodist Church in Des Moines, Iowa. Beginning in 1975 our congregation has been directly responsible for resettling thirty-two refugees, as well as becoming a contact point for other refugees who have either moved into our neighborhood, lacked sponsorship, or, through relationships with our "own" refugees sought assistance in sundry matters, such as job-seeking, food assistance, household needs, relationships with schools, government agencies, and other concerns. We have also attempted to be a resource for other churches, groups, and individuals who have considered the possibility of helping to resettle refugees, with special regard to Indochinese.

In all there have been an almost uncountable number of work hours expended by members of Grace Church and their friends on behalf of the resettlement of these refugees. It is an idea in which we have a deep commitment and was accepted by our congregation because of who we are, and what we have been called to do because of our faith in Christ and His message of hope and service to all God's children. The task has not always been easy for us, in fact, it has occasionally been an awesome burden of tedious, time-consuming detail. Yet, in the overview, it has produced a

feeling of accomplishment, knowing that we have at least tried to move forward in the direction to which we have been called.

In specific response to the issues raised for address, I would have the following opinions:

1. The need for effective refugee resettlement programs including the international aspect of refugee resettlement.

As a nation we are still at or near the top of the economic heap - in spite of our present woes in this arena. But we are more. We are still the "land of the free and the home of the brave." We still beckon people to our land with the enmarblized words: "Give me your tired, your poor, Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, The wretched refuse of your teeming shore, Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me: I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Perhaps because we are these things and say these things we are honor-bound to mean them, for Americans have cherished integrity, too. Perhaps because all save the native Americans are the issue of immigrants we sense the struggle of the refugee. It may well be understood that we could not possible manage to accept all the world's tempest-tossed, yet because we are what we are - just the same as my congregation knows and accepts what it is - this nation does not really dare to close its "golden door" upon the souls "yearning to breathe free."

I asked the father of the first family of ten we helped to resettle in 1975 just why he wanted to come to this country. It would have been possible for him to have gone to any one of several other nations at the time, but he elected ours. His response was worth noting: "I came here because I want to be free, and America is known as a place of freedom."

When is our obligation to the homeless over? Is it ever really over? As long as there are refugees in the world we need to do our part in providing for them. For the Cubans, the Indochinese and others of most recent as well as the distant past, we still offer a sanctuary of opportunity. It was the force that brought the first pilgrims to these shores. We simply need to understand that the Pilgrims have been coming here ever since 1620, and no doubt will continue to do so as long as we seek to stay the "land of the free."

Still, how do we deal with those 'masses yearning to breathe free?" It seems mere common sense that there must be an effective plan to accept and assist them as well as those who offer voluntarily their time and resources. The plan must be effective enough to touch on all the many detailed aspects of resettlement, yet simple enough to administrate with reasonable ease. I wish I had such a plan, but I confess I do not. But I am led to the next issue, which may well be a starting point.

2. Iowa's resettlement program and why it is successful.

It is my considered opinion that the success of Iowa's program is directly related to the force of the initial establishment of the Iowa Refugee Service as an arm of interest under the close guidance of the Governor's office. Governor Robert Ray's personal commitment and unique leadership has given rise to an agency with a single minded drive to do the finest job possible. His selection of Ms. Colleen Shearer was a masterful stroke, for she has given unparalled leadership to a unique gathering of dedicated persons. Her association with the Job Service is precisely the direction much of effort for refugee resettlement has had to take. The use of talented refugees within the Service Center is another major strength of the program in Iowa, and one quickly becomes aware of the senstivity to special needs of each ethnic group (and there are indeed many such groups) with their different and sometimes complex self-images and life styles.

The manner in which careful analysis of a potential refugee's possible needs, and an equally sensitive selection of a sponsor who is capable of producing the greatest of assistance toward eventual assimilation, has made the program most effective.

I have also been impressed with the continuous monitoring of the changing needs of the refugees. The refugees are not merely "dropped"on the sponsors. The task is shared, with refugee and sponsor free to consult with the Service Center in order to meet ongoing needs as they arise. I have had many occasions when I have sought their advice and expertise and on each such occasion found willingness and dedication to the task. That has made a key difference in our own willingness to reach out again and again as sponsors.

Another aspect of the Iowa program which perhaps is not unique, but is most certainly a positive factor, is the tireless dedication of the sponsors. Whether it is because Iowans seem to know the value of food, shelter and jobs, or merely have a soft spot in their hearts for the have-nots of the world, or just have a greater awareness of their own responsibility as the center of the world's breadbasket to the hungry and poor, I could not really say. I only know I have been immensely proud of my fellow Iowans watching them do a yeoman's job in meeting one of the world's greatest needs.

3. Local and Federal funding of resettlement programs.

I can tell you that had it not been for funding beyond what we were able to provide for our sponsored refugees, the task would have been next to impossible. The scarcity of jobs throughout this period, the high cost of housing, transportation, food, household energy, medical needs, and everything else makes the establishment of completely new households "ex nihilo" - out of nothing - a step one takes with fear and trembling. The possibitiy of resettlement exists today only because there are dependable methods of finding assistance for food, medicine, and other needs through the available programs, open to use until they no longer are needed.

In our own case all but one family has been set free of assistance from food stamp and medical programs. In that case, however, there is a very special circumstance, since the father of this family of ten died suddenly while at work providing for his family. At the time of his death the family was nearly ready to drop both food stamp and medical assistance. Now, after continued help from both these programs and Aid To Dependant Children, as well as job training under the auspices of Job Corps the family is again nearing the position of moving away from public assistance programs.

Whether these funds ought to be provided and administered locally or Federally I do not see as a critical issue, as long as they are not lost for use by refugees. There will be a continued need for programs such as Job Corps, WIN, and Title XIX (Medical Assistance) for most refugees reaching us in these difficult times. It has been my observation and experience that most refugees, while willing to accept help, are anxious to become self-sufficient as soon as possible. It seems to be the rare case, at least among

the Indochinese refugees with whom I have most contact that abberates from this norm. This has been the approach our congregation has taken - to move as quickly as is comfortably possible toward self-support. We see it as upholding the dignity of the refugee to be able to make it on his or her own.

4. How Iowa's program may be implemented on a national level.

I am not aware of another state which has had the unique relationship between the Governor's office and the resettlement agency. It would be my opinion that this is one of the major strengths to be emulated by other state administrations looking for success. The attention to detail, close scrutiny of the entire process, long after the refugees have made their way to their new home, and many of the other aspects of Iowa's program are matters developed and appreciated in direct proportion to the dedication of those responsible for the program. The model of preparation of sponsors for their task, the myriad of assistance offered, makes the sponsor's journey into this scarcely traveled land a more reliable one. The insistance that refugees have sponsors is a key factor in Iowa's success rate.

There was an open invitation to speak to other matters of importance in regard to the resettlement of refugees. I have four other concerns to which I would speak briefly.

The first is the matter of jobs and job training. Earlier I mentioned that for us the Job Corps provided much assistance in training young refugees in both English and with a marketable skill. We have helped three such young men go through that program. I find it to be a welcome enterprize, and one that needs to continue. Without jobs the refugee is helpless, feels caught, and is emasculated from his basic responsibility to provide for the family. Employers who have hired refugees have often remarked to me and others that they are most reliable, dedicated, have less absenteeism, and are very industrious. Somehow employers need to be encouraged to seek out refugees for hire, perhaps not to the exclusion of any other groups, but at least to the point of inclusion as a potentially important source of labor.

A second matter is the continued need of language programs. English is a basic tool for the American worker, student and consumer. The sooner the

language is comprehended, the quicker the assimilation may take place. I have been most impressed with the English-As-A-Second-Language programs for this reason. I would hope that funding and support for this program will remain at a constant. Though I would not want any ethnic group to lose its cultural heritage, an important factor in their identity, I still deeply believe that familiarity with our language is most important, and help must be provided whenever and wherever necessary to continue the program.

Third, speaking as I do as a representative of refugee sponsors, I can tell you that there is a very special relationship which develops between these two entities. The sponsor becomes the focal point of assistance for the refugee. While the refugee needs a guiding hand, especially in the first months, perhaps even year or more of residence, the sponsor receives in turn the satisfaction that he or she is truly needed and wanted, sharing in the redevelopment of persons from far-away lands into citizens giving their potential to their new community and nation. There is a sense of ownership which mutually enhanses the two and gives a greaterchance of success to the program. I wish I had the statistics to underscore this, but I know I would not be wrong in pointing out that there is a much greater success rate and higher achievement among refugees with sponsors than those without. This has testimony from the refugees themselves, for they will seek out on their own someone to "be their sponsor" once they begin to see how their compatriots are doing with and without them.

Further, the sponsors have saved an incredible amount of money for the American taxpayer. If you were to take our first resettlement case, add up the cost of funds collected privately, clothing, food furniture, utensils, and other household goods donated, include the hours of volunteered time given until the family was free from anything but moral support, the sum comes to $4,000 to 6,000, minimum. Multiply that by the approximately 740 family units Iowa has resettled (740 x $5,000) and Iowans have saved $3.7 million. If the same multiplication were to take place for the 250,000 refugees with sponsors all over the nation, the sum become $250,000,000. On the basis of savings to the taxpayer alone, it would seem that whatever assistance and support that can be given to finding, counselling and guiding sponsors is well worth the cost and effort.

The final issue I would consider is the system. Indeed, one of the most beneficial of helps may be to look very carefully at the system itself. From first-hand experiences I know that it is often a tedious, demeaning and frustrating experience to attempt to get help from the Social Services Department. I do not fault the people who work there, for they have been genuinely kind and helpful, doing what is actually their job. Neither do I fault the people who must use the system, for most are really only seeking whatever help they need to provide for a family in a time of desperation and need. I fault the system itself which has become overburden with checks and balances, stop gaps and conditions, paperwork beyond belief, much of which hardly ever pertains to your specific case. Nonetheless, the ritual is the same, in triplicate and computerized. I sometimes scream for simplicity of form and application, especially when it applies to refugees who really have so little to prove that they are in great need as they come to us with merely the clothes on their backs.

Once more I thank you for this opportunity to represent what I feel is a key element in the resettlement of refugees: the sponsor.

Respectfully,

James R. Nelson

Senator GRASSLEY. I have questions for both Mr. Houng and Mr. Somsak, that I'd like to have you both respond to, if you would.

Throughout our history, refugees as a group have proven very industrious, productive citizens. Why do you think the welfare dependency rates are so high among Indochinese refugees?

Mr. SOMSAK. That's not the case for those who came in 1975, but after.

Senator GRASSLEY. It's a recent development?

Mr. SOMSAK. Yes. The percentage has increased drastically in very recent years, because of the way that the different voluntary agencies have practiced accepting the sponsors.

I think before, the general public was quite responsive to the needs, and that being able to respond by becoming more sponsors and involved in all aspects of the family's life, so good directions and good instructions has been given and shared by the immigrant group.

And, of course, at that time I think probably the job has been more stressed and emphasized in the process of helping the family become self-sufficient.

But in the later years, I think because of the numbers of refugees admitted to this country and the quality of the sponsors, getting into even asking the relatives who have been here for not so many years, who are not quite ready, even though they are so concerned about the relatives joining them in this country, and so forth; but talking about readiness, I don't think they are quite ready to assume responsibility of sponsorship. And that extends to the individual Americans as sponsors, as well.

So I think the quality of sponsors has played a major role in getting the family off of welfare rolls.

Senator GRASSLEY. Did you finish?

Mr. SOMSAK. Yes.

Senator GRASSLEY. Would you like to comment on that, Mr. Houng?

Mr. HOUNG. Yes, sir. As my experience, I would say the welfare does start in 1979 only, because in 1975, in my group we had no welfare assistance. Even myself, I didn't know how to apply for food stamps or medicare.

So the reason for the refugees in the welfare are two reasons. First is the old refugees that used to work in this country, and they learn about a system and they know the system, and then they have some relative in the camp and they don't know how to explain to them. They say, "If you come to this country, the government can help you." And that idea makes the refugees over there think that when they come to this country they would be helped by the government.

So when they arrive to this country, when we take them to apply for jobs, and so on, the reaction of the employer was different from the first group. So the employer asks for English speaking, so they refuse the non-English speaking. Then the refugees, when they didn't have the jobs, so they stayed home. Their resettlement money was out. So the only resource is going to the welfare, so they went to the welfare.

Senator GRASSLEY. How can our resettlement efforts be improved, and welfare dependency decreased in order to continue our

resettlement efforts in this country and to ensure that new refugees attain self-sufficiency rapidly?

In other words, what can we do about our programs to make them work better, so that we don't have dependency?

Mr. SOMSAK. Jobs is going to be the key. When I first came to this country, of course, even though my experience of being in this society—and that's gone back to when I came as a student—after the fall of our country, when I came back it was very, very hard for me to enter into my professional field, so I had to be happy with what was available in order for me to feel at home.

And at that time, I think, in order for me to feel at home, was to be able to do something to help myself, to start from wherever I can start from. And that's the feeling.

And I think the majority of our people feel that they have to feel at home in order to be self-sufficient, to be a part of the society. The only way they can feel at home is to be able to help themselves. And that's the talk about jobs.

Talking about jobs, way back in 1975, when I had to help the early arrivals, who could hardly speak a word of English, but because of the openness of the employers to try them in a job—it's a matter of explaining to them what needs to be done from day to day, and so forth, and then from there, then the long exposure to the job and the environment, and so forth, they'll be able to function, be able to work.

So I think jobs is going to be the key. Not that I'm not agreeing with the training, but talking about training, again, a lot of our people are at a different level and will need a different duration. So now the refugees coming to this country are quite, quite—are having a background from the village, simple farmers, and so forth, and a lot of them are apparently never used to attending a program—a structured kind of a program, and so forth. So it might be very, very difficult for them to learn or to go through or benefit from a training program.

In other words, I think it probably will take longer, but if the Government is choosing a training way—emphasizing training, the majority of them probably would have to be stuck in the program for a numbr of years in order for them to get into a level that they will be able to be fluent in English, for example.

I think the long exposure to the work, to employment, is going to help them feel at home and give them some incentive to learn and to be able to help their families and to feel at home in their communities.

Senator GRASSLEY. Is it too easy to get on welfare in America?

Mr. SOMSAK. The system, I think, has provided so. And I think it makes us—the Iowa Refugee Service Center makes us so vulnerable, because here we are trying to provide directions to the refugees coming into the State, and of course, when the group of Tai Dam was admitted to the State, we have been able to use our power to influence others to stand by to help whatever family would need financial help, instead of going to a system. We have been able to do so, and I think the majority of them have been able to go into the direction of finding themselves a job, rather than availing themselves of receiving so much assistance from either us or going to a social services office.

Senator GRASSLEY. Would you like to comment on either one of those?

Mr. HOUNG. Yes. Back to the first question, about how to improve the refugee resettlement, I would say in the past we didn't have any planning for the refugees, when we were taking in the refugees. But right now we have the camp in Thailand or in other countries in Asia, so instead, the refugee waiting to be resettled in the third country, the refugees must be taught some vocational training or some ESL before coming to this country.

Then before coming to this country an employer—a sponsorship is needed, but it is preferred to have the employer, a certain industry or business, to be sponsor so they can employ the refugee.

Talking about the self-sufficiency, it's very difficult to point out in general, because it depends on individuals; like they will speak English when they come to this country, they can find a job after a few weeks, so they can be self-sufficient very quickly. But for the people who never go to school, that's very hard to have a quick self-sufficiency.

Senator GRASSLEY. That's all the questions I have.

I want to thank all the witnesses for your participation. Of course, you two were the only ones who have been through the process, and you can speak with experience, so you ought to feel free as the months pass, as we're writing legislation, to contact me. And I hope you don't have any reluctance to contact a U.S. Senator, because you shouldn't have. I have a daughter-in-law who is Korean, and it seems to me like she has a reluctance to communicate to me because I'm a public official—not so much because I'm her father-in-law—because in Korea, it's my understanding, people have great respect for government leaders in their country, but don't communicate directly with them. We don't ever want to get involved in this country with that. In fact, it's just the opposite. What can we do to build up some respect for Congressmen? That's something we've got to do. We've done things that have caused people to lose respect for us, and in the process there's been some loss of respect for the institutions of American Government.

As good as our Constitution is, our whole system of government is related to the confidence that people have in it and in their elected officials.

So I'm only saying this to you, if you might be like my daughter-in-law, and have some reluctance to communicate with people who are in Government, I hope you won't have.

Since it wasn't possible to have everybody testify who maybe wanted to testify today, anyone, whether you're in this audience today or whether you know somebody who is not here, anybody wishing to, may submit written testimony within the next 7 days, and your written testimony or their written testimony will be printed in the record.

I thank all of you, even those of you who are in the audience who didn't participate, who only listened. I thank you all for your attendance today. I think we have had some very valuable testimony and, hopefully, we can take what we've learned here in Des Moines, Iowa, and particularly with the very unique Iowa refugee settlement program, back to Washington and develop a positive national program relating to refugee resettlement.

Thank you all very much.

[Whereupon, at 2 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

[Following are written statements submitted to the subcommittee:]

APPENDIX

THE FEDERATION OF LAO ASSOCIATIONS OF THE AMERICAS
A Non-Profit Organization
P.O. Box 173
Oakdale, Iowa 52319

October 7, 1981

The Honorable Charles E. Grassley
721 Federal Building
210 Walnut Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50309

Dear Senator Grassley:

First of all, I would like to express my appreciation for your asking me to submit this written testimony for the hearing you will be chairing on October 9, 1981 in Des Moines, Iowa. We Lao refugees in America are gravely troubled by the Special Refugee Advisory Panel's report and the views on Indochinese refugees held by some members of the U.S. congressional fact-finding team. The conclusions drawn by the panel and the team that many Lao people flee the country for economic reasons, we feel, are erroneous, even demeaning, considering the humiliation and the risks faced by the escapees and the social and political reality inside Laos. The issue should be viewed under broader considerations so that human values and fundamental rights can be preserved and not to be sacrificed in the name of sheer economics.

Over the past several years approximately 200,000 Lao have fled their homeland. This is astonishing, because the Lao people have always had a strong sedentary tradition. They have always been deeply rooted in the home villages. In the past, they would seldom move even to another town, much less to a faraway country. Before the Communist takeover, not even prolonged wars or times of economic hardship could persuade the Lao people to leave the country forever.

What is it that has induced them to do so now? Have they suddenly given up their traditions? Have they suddenly decided that making a better living is more important to them than maintaining their ties to the country of their birth?

Many of the Lao people who have fled, or have tried to flee, are simple farmers from the countryside--people who know little about the outside world and who have no idea how they will make a living there. What they know about the outside world--what they have learned in whispered conversations--is that it is very difficult to get there from Laos. They know that anyone who seeks to leave Laos must not only give up all his possessions but must also risk his own life and the lives of his family. Perhaps his wife or his child will be shot by the Communist border guards as the family tries to escape into Thailand. And those who make it across the border alive may be robbed, beaten, raped, or jailed once they are in Thailand.

All these risks are well known to all prospective escapees from Laos. No one would subject himself to these risks and humiliation merely to better himself economically. No one would subject himself to risks and humiliation like these unless the alternative to such risks and humiliation was life under an intolerably oppressive regime.

Life in Communist Laos is intolerably oppressive, and that is why so many Lao people have risked their lives to try to reach freedom and why so many continue to risk their lives in this way. They do not leave for economic reasons. They leave because of persecution. They leave because they have found that they are misled by the empty promises of the Phathet Lao. They leave because they are forced to work all day without pay and to participate in "indoctrination" sessions every evening while their children are left at home unattended and unfed. They leave because the Communists watch over everything they do. They leave because false accusations against people are frequent and people are arrested without due process of law. They leave because their country, from the village level up to the level of the central government in Vientiane, has been sold out to and infiltrated by the Vietnamese of Hanoi. They leave because their cultural heritage -- their most basic beliefs about religion and the family system -- has been destroyed. They leave because there is no freedom of speech -- because anything that is said about the government may be construed as a criminal act. They leave because there is no freedom of assembly -- because any meeting of two or three people may be construed as a criminal conspiracy. They leave because they do not want to live in constant fear and anxiety. They leave because they know that life is not worth living under circumstances like those.

The conclusion the Special Panel drew from interviews with refugees was that refugee camps in Thailand were more attractive places for the Lao people to live than their homes in Laos. Of what does this attractiveness consist? Does it consist of the meager rations the refugees are given to eat? Does it consist of the smelly, overcrowded, tin-roofed huts under the 80 degree sun the refugees are given to live in? Does it consist of the inadequate water supply, the inadequate toilet facilities, or the general unsanitary conditions of the refugee camps? Certainly these things would not be "attractive" to the Lao or any other sane human beings. What is attractive about these squalid camps is that inside them people don't have to live in constant fear; they can talk without being afraid of being reported to the authorities and arrested; that they can live together with their families in freedom. The economic motive is not the primary reason for their escape.

Now the Thai government has adopted a new policy toward Lao refugees. The new policy says that all Lao refugees of 1981 are "illegal aliens" and must be deported to Laos. The "illegal aliens" have been put into prison camps, such as the one at Napho, Nakhone Phanom, where 7,449 Lao refugees are imprisoned. What are the living conditions of these people? what is to be their fate? Nobody knows. The camp was declared off limits, not only to the members of the Special Panel but also to the UNHCR and the ICRC. As you know, this sort of treatment of refugees is not only inhumane, but it is also against the international law regarding refugees. Therefore we beg you to do what you can to help bring about justice to these refugees.

We believe the latest strong Thai action against the Lao stems from the anticipated American reduction of refugee admissions. The Thai policy may have slowed down the refugee flow. The fact remains, however, that percecution and injustice still exist in Laos.

In 1977 and 1978 the Thai government and the UNHCR launched a repatriation program for Lao refugees. Many Lao people were forced to return to Laos. What was the result? The people who were repatriated were accused of being spies, and many of them were killed by Communists.

Another voluntary repatriation program has been launched since 1980. It is claimed that about 300 Lao have been successfully resettled under this program. However, these people have been repatriated to the remote parts of Laos, where they cannot be sufficiently monitored by the UNHCR to assure their safety. It is important to note that a) every Lao being repatriated is told that they have no hope to be resettled in third countries, and b) they will be looked after by the UNHCR for six months only after their return.

For Lao refugees -- for all of us who risked our lives to escape Communist persecution and settle in third countries -- repatriation is little more than a sentence of death. We urge the United States to free the refugees from this

sentence; we urge her to extend to the Lao people hope and freedom. We firmly believe that the right to freedom of our fellow countrymen is vital to the basic principles upon which this great democracy is founded.

With this in mind, we urge you to do all that you are able to:

1) preserve the integrity of the definition and status of refugees as stated in the Refugee Act of 1980;

2) make no distinction between "refugee" and "economic migrant" among the Lao; and

3) accord the same rights and freedom to the Lao as to the other Indochinese who are suffering from the oppressive Communist regimes.

We greatly appreciate your sympathetic consideration of our concern.

Sincerely,

Bounlieng P.

Bounlieng Phommasouvanh, Ph.D.
President

Des Moines Public Schools

Wesley S. Chapman
Director of Intercultural Affairs

1800 Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50307
515/284-7781

Mr. Chairman, committee members, panel members and other interested participants in attendance:

I am Wesley S. Chapman, Director of Intercultural Programs for the Des Moines Independent Community School District. One of the areas of responsibility in the Office of Intercultural Programs is the administration of the English As A Second Language Program which serves approximately 1400 students in the Des Moines Public Schools. With the present amount of attention being given to the resettlement of refugees throughout the country and in the State of Iowa, I am pleased to submit for your review, written comments on The Status of the Refugee Resettlement Program in the Des Moines Independent Community School District.

Since 1975 the State of Iowa has been one of the leading states in a national effort to resettle Southeast Asian refugees. Des Moines, being the capitol of the State of Iowa and the state's largest urban center, has experienced a large number of refugees settling in the immediate community. Listed under Table I is an overview of those numbers enrolled and maintained in the Des Moines Public Schools during this seven-year resettlement period.

This enrollment increase from 1975 (198) to 1981 (1338) has resulted in a restructuring, of the educational program in some areas designed to meet the unique needs of this constantly growing population -- 1338 Southeast Asian students in the Des Moines Public Schools. Approximately 65% or 867 out of 1338 Southeast Asian students attending the Des Moines schools during the 1981-82 school year have been identified as limited English speaking and are assigned to an English As A Second Language Program. Additionally, some instruction and classroom support are provided in the child's native language.

A majority of the Southeast Asian students attending the Des Moines Public Schools have missed or have not been exposed to an extensive and formal educational program. The primary barrier facing many of the students that enter the Des Moines Public Schools is an understanding of the English language and its use in the school and the community. This barrier is evident not only within the schools but poses a formidable barrier in the community-at-large.

The educational needs of Southeast Asian students enrolled in the Des Moines schools are of prime concern to parents, refugee sponsors, community members and local educators. During the seven-year history of the refugee resettlement program in the State of Iowa, the question of "approach" combined with need has been debated in the Des Moines community.

Efforts continue to be made to strengthen those program areas that are designed to meet the unique needs of a student population that has grown from 198 students in 1975 to 1338 in 1981. Any attention given to national policy on refugee resettlement must address the educational approaches, issues and budgetary concerns that result from this nationally, with state support, initiated resettlement effort.

The Des Moines Public Schools English as a Second Language (ESL) Program was initiated in 1975 and administered by the district's Language Arts supervisor. Regarding program structure, several approaches were considered. At that time, the development of an intensive language training center was opposed due to the possibility of creating a racially isolated school which would have pushed the District out of compliance with the U.S. Office of Civil Rights. It was decided by the Superintendent

that Southeast Asian students would be assigned to regular neighborhood schools with the right to receive up to three hours of tutorial assistance (English) from a bilingual resource teacher. However, it was agreed that intensive language training would be provided for Southeast Asian students during the summer months.

Table I shows that in 1975 there were 198 Southeast Asian students enrolled in the Des Moines Public Schools. Initially, the majority of refugee students were Vietnamese and had experienced some sort of formal language training (either French or English) while in Viet Nam. For the Viet students, a teacher was contracted to provide tutorial services in the various schools where these students were enrolled. This particular teacher was proficient in only the North and South Vietnamese languages. This limitation posed a serious problem when an influx of Lao, Thai Dam and Hmong students were enrolled in the schools. Unlike the Vietnamese, these students had very little or no previous school experience.

By 1976, the Southeast Asian population had increased to 392. To better meet the language acquisition and acculturation needs of the Lao, Thai Dam and Hmong students, nine bilingual tutors of Southeast Asian descent were employed by the District. These growth changes are shown in Table I. The first summer intensive language training program also was offered in the summer, 1976.

The ESL/Bilingual Program for Southeast Asian students underwent a major overhaul during the 1977-78 school year. Table I shows the revisions. Contrary to the Superintendent's neighborhood school proposal, Southeast Asian student enrollment was restricted to twenty-one schools, especially in schools where minority student enrollment was low. Having students concentrated in certain schools appeared to be more efficient and economical than trying to deliver services to a handful of students in every neighborhood school. Consequently, five certified teachers and three bilingual tutors were employed to provide ESL services. Both the teachers and tutors travelled between buildings. The Southeast Asian population at that time was 458. As indicated in Table I, the refugee student population leaped to 587, however, the ESL program and staff remained the same during the 1978-79 school year.

As shown in Table I, the ESL/bilingual resource classrooms were the added features during the 1979-80 school year. The number of schools offering ESL/bilingual services were reduced so that resource rooms could be established and travel between buildings could be curtailed. During that year, the teaching staff was increased to ten, the number of tutors remained the same, and the Southeast Asian student enrollment mushroomed to 751.

To meet the growing need of these students, the ESL/bilingual program was expanded to serve 19 schools during the 1980-81 school year. Moving more in the direction of the resource teacher concept, the number of certified teachers was increased to 23 while 3 additional tutors were hired. Table I shows that the Southeast Asian student enrollment climbed to 1,041.

For the current school year, 1981-82, 1,338 Southeast Asian students have been enrolled in the Des Moines Public Schools. As illustrated in Table I, there are 23 teachers and 6 tutors offering services at 20 elementary schools.

The ESL/bilingual program is progressing toward exemplary status. The district has moved from the fragmented tutoring approach to the more comprehensive resource room concept.

The Des Moines community and the Des Moines Public Schools committed themselves to implementing a federal-initiated program in 1975, a program planned at that time to resettle Southeast Asian refugees. The program has increased markedly since 1975 and there is every indication that the growth experience will continue in the future. This program which began, initially as a federal directive is now a local mandate supported primarily, through local resources. These and related factors must be present before decisions are considered and future policy statements are contemplated. The Des Moines experience is not unique but with an increasing population, there are increasing needs as substantiated by the information that is included with these comments.

As policy decisions ar made, the Des Moines experience, unique as it is, serves to demonstrate how a federal-initiated program can be implemented on a state and/or local level. With an increasing population there is an increasing need; our ability to respond to these needs will be greatly influenced at the local level. Every effort must be made to address what is a federal, state and local program.

The statements included in this paper are not intended to answer all the questions that might be raised on resettlement policy. It is our hope that as national policy is discussed, the Des Moines situation, unique as it is, will be considered.

THE STATUS OF THE REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM IN THE DES MOINES INDEPENDENT COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

PRESENTED TO

SENATOR CHARLES E. GRASSLEY

SENATE JUDICIARY SUB-COMMITTEE
ON IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE POLICY

BY

WESLEY S. CHAPMAN
DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF INTERCULTURAL PROGRAMS
DES MOINES INDEPENDENT COMMUNITY
SCHOOL DISTRICT

STATE CAPITOL BUILDING
ROOM 118
DES MOINES, IOWA
OCTOBER 9, 1981

TABLE I

Seven Year Summary of Southeast Asian ESL/Bilingual Program in the Des Moines Public Schools
1975 - 1982

School Year	ESL Resource Centers	Number of Certified Teachers	Number of Bilingual Tutors	Number of Southeast Asian Students Enrolled In ESL Program	Total Enrollment of Southeast Asian Students	Numerical Increase of Total Southeast Asian Student Enrollment over Base Year, 1975-76
1975-76	All Schools	1	0	198	198	--
1976-77	All Schools	1	9	392	392	194
1977-78	21	5	3	458	458	260
1978-79	21	5	3	450	587	389
1979-80	16	10	3	575	751	553
1980-81	19	23	6	660	1041	843
1981-82	20	23	6	867*	1338*	1,140

*Included in this figure are 52 students who enrolled after the official district enrollment count on September 11, 1981.

TABLE II

Seven Year Budget Summary of Southeast Asian ESL/Bilingual Program in the Des Moines Public Schools
1975 - 1982

Year	Local	State	Federal	TOALS
1975-76	$ 35,079.22	--	--	$ 35,079.22
1976-77	86,697.97	--	--	86,697.97
1977-78	168,747.82	--	--	168,747.82
1978-79	167,595.37	--	--	167,595.37
1979-80	301,780.80	--	--	301,780.80
1980-81	420,692.52	89,683.68	103,951.02	614,327.22
1981-82	556,512.00	--	103,000.00*	659,512.00

*Anticipated federal funds to be received during the 1981-82 school year.

Testimony for the Subcommittee on
Immigration and Refugee Policy of the
Senate Judiciary Committee
Hearing on Refugee Resettlement

October 9, 1981

As a refugee sponsor of Stover Memorial Church of the Brethern in Des Moines, and as Refugee Coordinator for the Church of the Brethern, Northern Plains District, which is inclusive of Iowa, I appreciate this opportunity to speak in favor of further refugee resettlement.

The Church of the Brethern has been active in refugee placement and sponsorship, and traditionally has been involved in helping the oppressed, the persecuted, the hungry, and the sick. This mandate was given to us by Jesus in Matthew 25:34-45, who said we are to feed the hungry, provide water for the thirsty, invite strangers into our homes, and cloth the naked....for, "Inasmuch as you have done it unto one of the least of these My brethern, you have done it unto Me."

This country has been blessed, and even though we are all feeling the effects of our inflationary economy, we can afford to share our wealth with others who have been victims of ravaged, torn countries.

I am committed to helping these homeless as are many others in the Brethern Community. I would encourage the continuance of the refugee resettlement program in the United States. Thank you.

Submitted by:

Sandra J. Bethel, Refugee Sponsor;
Refugee Coordinator for the Church
of the Brethern, Northern Plains
District